



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 2016

No. 46

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 24, 2016, at 11 a.m.

## House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 2016

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 23, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Assure them that in the fulfillment of their responsibilities, You provide the grace to enable them to be faithful in their duties, and the wisdom to be conscious of their obligations, and fulfill them with integrity.

As the Congress looks to the upcoming Holy celebrations of millions of Americans, may they—and may we all—be mindful of Your love for us. May we be faithful stewards not only of Your creation, but also Your desire that all people would be free from whatever inhibits them being fully alive.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### PEACE CORPS MEDICAL ISSUES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Nick Castle was a bright, energetic 23-year-

old who decided to teach in China, following his graduation from UC Berkeley.

Tragically, Nick became seriously sick after becoming a Peace Corps volunteer in China in 2012. He was the victim of an inefficient, under-equipped, and unresponsive Peace Corps-led medical team there.

After being prescribed a broad antibiotic, Nick began to experience drastic weight loss, but was told he was fine. He was then confined to bed, but his doctor never recommended he go to the hospital.

After experiencing dangerously low blood pressure, Nick was finally sent to the hospital. As the ambulance made its way to him, it got lost. Then, after picking him up, Nick stopped breathing before the ambulance arrived at the hospital. Nick died a few weeks later, in early 2013.

Investigations revealed the Peace Corps medical team misdiagnosed his illness. This heartbreaking death of a young man serving our country and the world could have been avoided had the Peace Corps staff assisted in having a properly trained, equipped, and responsive team.

Mr. Speaker, Peace Corps volunteers are America's angels abroad. They are some of the best that we have. They are the spirit of humanitarian assistance, and America must make sure to take care of these amazing people when they serve in lands far, far away so that there are no more deaths like Nick Castle's.

And that is just the way it is.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1555

## CRISIS IN FLINT, MICHIGAN

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing crisis in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, is a real tragedy. This failure of government has affected 100,000 people—adults and children—who, after months and months, still do not have clean drinking water.

It is my view that the State of Michigan bears the principal responsibility for this crisis and should step up and do more. It was the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality that failed to a great extent.

I know there are Members who share my view that there is responsibility at every level of government. We could argue about how we apportion that responsibility, but in the meantime, people in Flint still can't drink the water, and they need help. They deserve help from the State and from the Federal Government. They are citizens of Michigan, but also citizens of the United States, who are facing a disaster, a crisis, and have every right to expect that their government will step in to help them, especially when it is clear that it was the government that made the decisions that led to this crisis.

So I ask that we not recess until we take up legislation to provide direct help to the city of Flint. It is something that I think is our moral responsibility. It is unconscionable that we would leave this body without acting.

## LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR V. BURWELL

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today the High Court is considering the Little Sisters of the Poor v. Burwell, a most important case regarding religious liberty and the First Amendment.

The Little Sisters of the Poor is a religious institution dedicated to assisting the elderly poor, but an unfair and unjust dilemma has been forced upon them. They must choose whether to violate their religious beliefs by complying with the HHS mandate or pay massive fines.

The government cannot compel people to violate their conscience and their religious faith. But today we are watching the government force people to choose between their faith or a government decree. To place citizens of this country in this inescapable position is not only reprehensible, but also a direct violation of the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that the Court be granted the wisdom and discernment necessary to resolve this case in support of religious liberty and conscience rights. People must not be forced by the government to violate their faith.

## LATIN EXPRESS BAND 40TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a legend since 1976 on the Dallas-Fort Worth music scene. The Latin Express Band is celebrating its 40th anniversary.

The Latin Express Band, founded by Carlos and Leo Saenz, comes a long way from their humble roots of playing high school dances. Over the past 40 years, they have played in music venues throughout the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolis and the country. In 2001, they were one of the music groups invited to perform at the Presidential Inaugural Ball. They were recently inducted into the Tejano R.O.O.T.S. Hall of Fame in 2008.

Along with their musical accolades, the Latin Express Band has inspired future generations of local musicians through their support of music education for children, youth, and adults.

On March 31st, the Saenz brothers will perform at Fort Worth's historic Casa Manana Theatre in honor of Cesar Chavez' birthday. Carlos and Leo have come a long way from their days playing at Sadie Hawkins dances back in the day, and I am honored to recognize their achievements.

Congratulations to the Latin Express Band.

## SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court earlier this week regarding the Second Amendment.

By overturning the decision by the Massachusetts Supreme Court, the Court has reaffirmed not only that Americans have the right to self-defense, but also that stun guns are covered under the Second Amendment.

The case began when a woman named Jaime Caetano was continually threatened by an abusive ex-boyfriend who, at one point, put her in the hospital. At the urging of a friend, she began carrying a stun gun for protection.

After an incident that a restraining order against her ex-boyfriend failed to prevent, the threat of a nonlethal device prevented any harm of Ms. Caetano. Yet, Massachusetts had previously outlawed the ownership of stun guns, and she was arrested.

Massachusetts' highest court sided against the Supreme Court's Heller decision, which set clear standards for the Second Amendment. The Supreme Court Justices clearly saw the foolishness in the State court's decision and reversed it this week, reasserting that the right to bear arms "extends to all instruments that constitute bearable arms, even those that were not in existence" when our Nation was founded.

This is a reminder that the rights of all Americans must be defended vigilantly by every generation. I commend the Supreme Court for its decision and Justice Alito for his concurring opinion that gives individuals in all States a necessary nonlethal option for protection against violence.

## TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF CONXITA MARTORELL CARRION

(Mr. GUTIÉRREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great woman of Puerto Rico, Conxita Martorell Carrion. Along with my wife Soraida and my family, we are deeply saddened by her loss.

Conxita was raised in Barcelona, but truly adopted Puerto Rico as her homeland. She loved Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans like few people I have ever met. From the beaches to the narrow streets of Old San Juan, the island was deeply loved by Conxita.

Conxita and Richard raised a beautiful family, but what I remember most about her is her passion and compassion for her adopted island home, and especially how she donated her time and love to shelter abused and battered girls.

She is in the thoughts and prayers of all Puerto Ricans.

And now, just a line or two in Spanish.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Mr. Speaker, my wife and our daughters will deeply miss the great generosity and welcoming spirit Conxita Carrion shared with our family. Here in the House I wanted to offer my humble thanks and my sincerest condolences to her husband Richard and their family.

Sr. Presidente, mi esposa y nuestras hijas profundamente extrañarán la gran generosidad y el espíritu acogedor que Conxita Carrion compartió con nuestra familia.

Aquí, en la cámara quisiera ofrecer mi humilde agradecimiento y mis más sinceras condolencias a su marido Richard y a su familia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide the Clerk a translation for the RECORD.

## HONORING MARY SMITH

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, as I travel throughout Michigan's Seventh District, I have had the privilege of getting to know some incredible women who have made a lasting mark on our communities. Mary Smith from Coldwater is one of them. If you live in Branch County, you know Mary. She is family.

Over the last 40 years, Mary has spent countless hours volunteering at

the Community Health Center of Branch County. She also helped lead the effort to restore the beautiful Tibbits Opera House, and is a passionate advocate for this iconic theater. At 97, she rode to the Tibbits on the back of my Harley.

Mary will turn 101 in June, and I continue to be inspired by her lifelong service to the community. This Women's History Month—and every month—we say thank you to women like Mary Smith, who have made invaluable contributions to Michigan, this country, and made our State a better place to live.

#### HONORING BEVERLEY YACHNIN

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge an outstanding pharmacist in my district, Beverley Yachnin.

A resident of Rochester Hills, Beverley has recently been named the 2016 Pharmacist of the Year by the Michigan Society of Community Pharmacists. This is a huge honor, and Beverley is actually the first pharmacist from my district to be awarded this prestigious distinction.

This is not, however, Beverley's first time being recognized for her work as a pharmacist. She was previously honored by the American Pharmacy Association with a One to One Patient Counseling Recognition Award in 2012, and two honorable mentions for the same award in 2008 and 2010.

Pharmacists play an important role in all of our lives. Our community is greatly enriched by Beverley's dedication to customer service and patient safety. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have such an outstanding pharmacist working and living in my district.

Thank you, Beverley Yachnin, for your commitment to the people you serve and our entire Rochester community.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

#### CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN BRUSSELS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 658) condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Brussels on March 22, 2016, which murdered more than 30 innocent

people, and severely wounded many more.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 658

Whereas, on March 22, 2016, at least three Islamist terrorists conducted coordinated attacks against two sites in Brussels, Belgium, resulting in the loss of more than 30 innocent lives and the severe wounding of many more innocent civilians;

Whereas a number of American citizens are among those wounded;

Whereas the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) has claimed responsibility for the attacks;

Whereas the brutal attacks at the Brussels airport and the Maelbeek metro station are the latest in a series of assaults by ISIS in Europe, including the November 13, 2015, terrorist attacks in Paris, France, that were deliberately aimed at killing and maiming as many innocent people as possible;

Whereas Belgian first responders and law enforcement reacted swiftly and heroically, caring for the wounded and taking immediate measures to prevent additional attacks and the further loss of life;

Whereas at least two of the terrorists were killed in the suicide bombings, and Belgian intelligence and law enforcement are pursuing others possibly connected to these attacks and to those in Paris;

Whereas Belgian Prime Minister Charles Michel called the attacks "a black moment" for the country and urged his fellow citizens to stay united in their response;

Whereas Belgium and its capital Brussels are the symbolic center of the alliance between the United States and Europe that was created following the devastation of World War II, including by hosting on its territory the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the institutions of the European Union;

Whereas Belgium and the United States have maintained strong ties based on shared values since Belgium's independence in 1831;

Whereas Belgium was a founding member of NATO in 1949 and has been a steadfast ally of the United States in the decades since;

Whereas, on September 12, 2001, for the first time in the history of the Alliance, Belgium joined our NATO allies to invoke Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty that states "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all";

Whereas Belgium has been a steadfast partner of the United States in the international effort to defeat ISIS and other terrorist threats;

Whereas the coordination of these attacks, following the terrorist assaults in Paris and in several other countries, demonstrates that ISIS members continue to plan and execute attacks, targeting United States interests and allies;

Whereas continued and enhanced intelligence cooperation, law enforcement engagement, and information sharing on emerging threats and identified Islamist extremists is essential to enhancing security for the people of the United States, Europe, and our allies around the world;

Whereas the loss of innocent lives in Brussels strengthens our resolve to defeat ISIS and its terrorist affiliates which pose a growing threat to international peace and stability; and

Whereas we stand in solidarity with our Belgian allies in their time of national mourning, ready to provide assistance in bringing to justice all those involved with

the planning and execution of these attacks, as well as identifying and disrupting any plans to undertake similar assaults in the future: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Brussels on March 22, 2016, which murdered more than 30 innocent people, and severely wounded many more;

(2) expresses its deepest sympathies and condolences for those killed and injured in the attacks and for their families and friends;

(3) pledges support for the Government of Belgium in its efforts to bring to justice all those involved with the planning and execution of these terrorist attacks;

(4) declares that the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) poses a fundamental threat to the universal value of freedom in all countries;

(5) remains concerned regarding the flow of foreign fighters to and from the Middle East and West and North Africa and the threat posed by these individuals; and

(6) expresses its readiness to assist the Government and people of Belgium to respond to the threat posed by ISIS and its terrorist affiliates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 0915

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 658, condemning the series of terrorist attacks in Belgium carried out by Islamist extremists yesterday.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution, condemning the terrorist attacks in Brussels carried out by Islamist extremists yesterday.

ISIS terrorists have once again struck in Europe, and this time in Belgium. The murderers coldly chose crowded areas at the Brussels Airport and at the metro system in order to kill and maim as many innocent men, women, and children as possible. And the latest numbers are 31 dead and 270 wounded, including a number of Americans.

ISIS has claimed responsibility for the attacks, the latest in a series that includes an horrific attack in Brussels, the attack in Paris, a double suicide bombing in Beirut, Lebanon, and the boast of responsibility for downing a Russian passenger jet in Egypt's Sinai Peninsula. The list of atrocities is far

longer, including those by ISIS affiliates elsewhere, such as the recent attack in Ivory Coast.

As these and other assaults show, ISIS is rapidly expanding its reach beyond its bases in Syria and in Iraq. Over 30,000 fighters from more than 100 countries have joined ISIS, including more than 250 Americans. We had a young Yazidi girl tell us that she was taken as a concubine by one of these Americans who had been recruited 4 years ago on the Internet by ISIS.

More than 4,500 of this terrorist diaspora hold Western passports and are both a plane ride away, a plane ride away from the United States and from Europe.

This resolution puts the House on record as condemning the attacks in Brussels and extends our sympathies to those affected by this tragedy, and it reaffirms our support for the people of Belgium in their time of national anguish.

But we must do more than just express our sorrow. We must take decisive action to eliminate the threat, including expanding information-sharing with our friends and allies, putting stronger border checks in place, combating the online propaganda and hate speech of ISIS extremists, and sharpening coalition efforts to destroy ISIS itself.

I will remind the Members that our committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, has held a series of hearings on this. When ISIS came out of Raqqa in the first place and headed towards the border and headed towards Fallujah, that was the time to hit this so-called JV team.

This group of guys in pickup trucks, as the President called them at the time, were an open target on the open desert as they headed to Fallujah and, after that, as they headed to city after city after city without us using our airpower to hit them early on. They finally took Mosul and, with it, they took the Central Bank of Iraq.

At this point, they have to be destroyed, and it is going to take a strategic plan to make certain the United States leads in that effort. We need to get it done.

Mr. KEATING. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 658, a resolution condemning yesterday's tragic attack in Brussels, Belgium.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Texas, Judge TED POE, chairman of the Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee, on which I serve as the ranking member, in expressing my deepest condolences to the victims, families, and loved ones of those affected by yesterday's brutal attacks.

The resolution before us today strongly condemns the terrorist attacks perpetrated in Brussels yesterday and expresses the sympathy of the House of Representatives for the people of Belgium. With the strength of the U.S. intelligence community, we

pledge our support for the Belgian Government in its efforts to investigate and to bring to justice all those involved with the planning and execution of these deadly plans.

Belgium remains one of our strongest allies, a nation with which we have worked closely in bilateral and multilateral arenas. Belgium was on our side as an active participant in the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, as a leader in the European Union mission in Mali, and as an ally in the 2010–2011 NATO operations in Libya.

As host of the European Union and NATO headquarters, Belgium—Brussels, in particular—represents both a symbolic and a concrete role in promoting transatlantic cooperation between our two countries and our allies.

It is not by accident that the Maelbeek metro station and the Brussels Airport were selected as the site for such heinous violence. Nearby, a mere stone's throw from the Maelbeek station, sits the headquarters of the European Union and numerous government offices, including the U.S. Embassy, which is less than a mile away.

Daily, hundreds, if not thousands of civil servants and public interest sector workers cross through the station on the way back and forth to work. And at Brussels Airport, dozens of innocent travelers and family members were drawn into a bloodshed that has spread from Iraq and Syria to the surrounding region and beyond.

I visited both while in Europe last year on a security codel, and I saw, firsthand, the strong police presence providing a sense of security for Brussels residents and visitors.

Due to the bravery, courage, and preparedness of Belgian law enforcement authorities and emergency response teams, many families were spared the pain of losing a loved one. And we honor, today, their quick action and their bravery.

These terrorist attacks are misguided attempts to divide the global coalition that has come together to degrade and defeat ISIS and their affiliates. From Ankara, to Istanbul, to Beirut, to Baga, we recognize that the prominent sentiment across the Middle East identifies ISIS rhetoric and actions as contrary to the tolerance and teachings of Islam.

While this remains an open investigation, the nature of yesterday's attacks hit close to home. Whether it is New York City, San Bernardino, or whether it is Boston—where I saw, firsthand, the resilience in spirit come forward that any physical attack can never conquer—we see that same spirit and resolve in the people of Brussels and Belgium today.

The flow of foreign fighters, the traveling that they do, and the extenuating threat that they pose have been our top security-related concerns here in Congress. Congress and the administration have taken actions to address these issues and prevent the risk of such an

attack here at home. We have tightened security restrictions for travelers from visa waiver countries who are known to have traveled to Iraq and Syria. We have sealed intelligence-sharing gaps between Federal, State, and local law enforcement, as well as our international partners in the intelligence community. And we are in the process of an unprecedented top-to-bottom review of airport security threats that will ensure our airports are safer than ever.

The international community, including governments and prominent organizations throughout the Middle East and Muslim-majority nations, have spoken out against these heinous attacks. With passage of this resolution, the U.S. Congress joins these communities around the world in its condemnation of the terrorist attacks yesterday in Brussels.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for his comments, for his support of this legislation, and also for the privilege to work with him on our Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee, where we have had numerous hearings on the issue of ISIS and other terrorist groups that are lurking throughout the United States and the world.

Mr. Speaker, the attacks began shortly before 8 a.m., with an explosion at a departure terminal at the Brussels Airport. The area was between two American airlines—American Airlines and Delta Air Lines—American companies. It was believed to be a luggage bomb, followed by another bomb shortly thereafter.

Then, at 9:11 a.m., Brussels time, a bomb tore through the last car of a subway train as it was pulling out of a station in central Brussels.

Belgian officials have said that the bombings killed at least 10 at the airport and at least 20 at the subway station. More than 230 others were wounded. Details are still surfacing, but we now know that at least 10 Americans were wounded in the attacks. One of those was a member of the United States Air Force.

Later in the afternoon, a news agency affiliated with ISIS issued a report bragging and claiming responsibility for the murders. Reports said that the attacks were in retaliation for Belgium's participation in a coalition against ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, ISIS, this group that is relatively new in the terrorist industry, has already committed 70 terrorist attacks worldwide in 20 countries, as of January 1 of this year, and yet this is one more. These attacks in Belgium occurred just 4 days after the capture of one of Europe's most wanted terrorists,

Salah Abdeslam, the sole survivor of the 10 men who carried out the November horrific attacks in Paris that killed 130 people.

The attacks in Belgium made it clear to all that ISIS still maintains operational networks in Europe, capable of carrying out attacks abroad, even as security services are on highest alert. The bombing in downtown Brussels occurred just steps away from major institutions, as the ranking member, Mr. KEATING, has pointed out.

Brussels is the capital of Belgium. It is the headquarters of the European Union. It is the headquarters of NATO. This bombing attack occurred near the U.S. Embassy that is there. This area, Brussels, Belgium, stands and represents, really, the free world's endeavor to work together under democracy and liberty and those ideals that we value. It was no accident that Brussels was picked for the attack.

The fact that ISIS could operate cells in Europe and manage to strike at the heart of European society only a few months after the Paris attacks should make us cognizant that our current strategy against ISIS is really not successful. ISIS has been able to hold on to territory for close to 2 years. It is from this territory in Iraq and Syria that it trains its fighters, recruits foreigners, and plans to launch attacks against not only Europe, but other countries, like the United States.

Words claiming progress and success against ISIS are meaningless when confronted with devastating carnage like what we saw in the United States, in San Bernardino, and what occurred in Paris and now in Brussels. The United States must change its strategy against ISIS. We must allow ISIS no safe haven anywhere in the world. We must take away their capabilities to strike American cities.

This resolution shows that the people of the United States stand alongside our European and Belgian allies in solidarity. The American people extend their deepest sympathies to those affected by the tragedy. Let the people of Belgium know that the United States will support them through this time in every way possible, and we must be more united in the face of this terrorist onslaught that threatens the very freedoms that we hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my colleague and fellow New Englander.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Texas for their extraordinary leadership on this important resolution.

Yesterday, the world saw the face of evil in a series of cowardly and despicable terrorist acts that claimed the lives of 34 innocent people in Brussels.

I, too, extend my thoughts and prayers to all of the families affected by this horrific violence.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, here in Congress, we must renew our commitment to keep Americans safe from terrorism, continue to support our intelligence services and law enforcement agencies in their critical work, and do all that is necessary to defeat and destroy these terrorists wherever they are.

□ 0930

Today the United States and the entire world are standing shoulder to shoulder with the people of Belgium. The ISIS terrorists who perpetrated these attacks did so in an attempt to strike fear into the heart of anyone who does not share their radical world views.

We have seen these same tactics tried before in our own country: in San Bernardino, at the Boston Marathon, the Pentagon, the World Trade Center, and in a field in Pennsylvania.

But for each time they have tried, terrorists have failed to shake the resolve of those they have targeted, and we will not allow them to succeed this time.

The motto of the country of Belgium is "eendracht maakt macht," "unity makes strength." Let there be no doubt.

We stand today united and strong with the people of Belgium. We will do whatever it takes, no matter how long it takes, to help Brussels rebuild and to bring all those responsible to justice.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Texas. I am pleased to join with them on this matter. I am pleased to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution, we are sending a clear message that we stand with the people of Belgium. Like my colleagues and like so many around the world, I am angry, I am outraged, and I am deeply, deeply saddened by the terrorist attacks that ripped through Brussels yesterday.

My heart goes out to those whose loved ones were killed or injured, and I am mindful there are families here in the United States that have been directly touched by this violence and that we are still uncertain how many Americans are themselves victims.

For me, as a New Yorker, let me speak personally because September 11, 2001, is a scar and a stain that will never go away as long as I live and as long as other New Yorkers live.

We know how it feels when hatred and violence take aim at our home. We know what it feels like when innocent people are killed by pure evil. So today we grieve with our brothers and sisters in Belgium.

But in the midst of grief, we cannot lose focus on our work to stop this kind

of violence. We need to stand with our Belgian friends not just in spirit, but in action, to figure out who was responsible for these attacks, how they were able to carry them out, and what it will take to hold them accountable.

We need to look for new areas for collaboration in terms of prevention, surveillance, and information sharing. Along with our coalition partners, we need to press ahead in our effort to destroy ISIS, which has claimed responsibility for yesterday's attacks.

How horrific, the thought that human life is so worthless to these terrorists. It is just absolutely amazing that they claim to be religious people but, instead, they are pure evil.

ISIS terrorists and other violent extremists target democratic societies because they want to shatter our spirit and force us to live in fear. We will not allow them to succeed.

Going forward, we will work with our Belgian partners and our other allies to move past this tragedy to fight terrorism, to enhance security, and to promote justice and democracy around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Again, I commend my good colleagues from Massachusetts and Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers and just will briefly close.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Texas.

In a Congress that is often divided, we speak as one. In a country that is sometimes divided, today we speak as one. With the citizens of the world who value freedom and abhor violence and value human life, we speak as one.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I thank again the ranking member of our full committee as well as the chair of the full committee for joining with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts do go out to the people of Brussels and the people who were killed and their families that are throughout the world, including those that are injured from the United States. We cannot bring back those lives from yesterday, but we can do something about the murder that occurred yesterday in Brussels.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the ISIS terror network is successful. ISIS exists for one reason, to murder people and, because of that murder and violence that they incur, to scare and to bring fear and terror to countries that are attacked by ISIS.

As I mentioned earlier, they have committed terror attacks in now 20 countries. To some extent, it seems to me that it is working because every time there is a terrorist attack, free

people react in the sense that we find more security.

I am concerned that we are getting into the bunker mentality, people afraid to go anyplace and afraid to leave. Why? Because some terrorist attack may occur.

It is obvious that we need to react to the crimes and these murders as a people that are affected by it. But we can't just be defensive against ISIS and other terrorist organizations. We can't just defend ourselves.

We have to eliminate ISIS. They are at war with the world and people who don't agree with them. They are at war. Now, we probably need to understand that their goal is to not only kill and maim, but to cause fear—fear—individual fear. They use every possible way they can do it, from social media to bragging about the murders on YouTube.

So we, as a people, need to understand that we are going to have to eliminate ISIS. We are going to have to track them down, go get them, and eliminate them. You can't negotiate with these people. That is out of the question.

So we either just react and try to defend ourselves when they commit crimes or we go after them. So I hope that the United States presents a better strategy and lets those folks know that, to just kill anybody that disagrees with ISIS, their days are numbered because we are going to go eliminate them. We have to.

Because they have attacked us, our response must be more than defensive. We must be offensive. We must let them know: you can't do this. You can't kill people because you don't like them, no matter where that occurs in the world.

So I would hope that the United States, with our partners in other countries, finds an overall strategy that is successful and that eliminates these people who kill because of a perverted sense of their religion.

But today we do mourn the loss and we show the support of our country with our neighbors across the seas for the crimes that have been committed against them.

As the ranking member has pointed out, this is an issue that is totally supported by both sides of the House. The Foreign Affairs Committee works together on almost all issues, and this is another example of that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 658 and in remembrance of the innocent victims who lost their lives, and those who were seriously injured, this morning in the barbaric attacks perpetrated by terrorists in Brussels, Belgium.

Our hearts and prayers are with the families and loved ones of the victims and our thanks and appreciation go to the first responders who selflessly came to the aid of their fellow members of the human family.

Brussels will emerge from today's attacks stronger than ever and more firmly committed

to the values and principles that have made it so great.

And as Brussels recovers and responds, I hope its people take comfort in the certain knowledge that the people of the United States stand in solidarity with them.

Today's attacks are a reminder of the common danger the free, democratic, and peace loving nations of the world face from those who reject the norms of civilized society and abuse the liberties and freedoms afforded them by free societies.

Those responsible for today's crime against humanity should make no mistake; they will be held to account in this life and the next.

But today our thoughts and prayers are with the people of Brussels, which represents everything terrorists despise: a symbol of the modern world where persons of differing faiths, creeds, races, and cultures live together in peace, harmony, and freedom.

That symbol is recognizable to Americans because it also represents the American heart and spirit.

The terrorist attacks in Brussels were horrific acts on innocent civilians perpetrated by depraved individuals who misuse the peaceful religion of Islam for their own misguided purposes.

Their horrible and heinous acts are their responsibility, and theirs alone, and for which they can be assured that they alone will be held accountable.

But that will come another day; today I ask a moment of silence for the victims killed and injured in the terrorist attacks in Brussels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 658.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### STANDARD MERGER AND ACQUISITION REVIEWS THROUGH EQUAL RULES ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 653, I call up the bill (H.R. 2745) to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 653, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2745

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAYTON ACT.

The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 4F and inserting the following:

#### "SEC. 4F. ACTIONS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OR THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

"(a) Whenever the Attorney General of the United States has brought an action under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission has brought an action under section 7, and the Attorney General or Federal Trade Commission, as applicable, has reason to believe that any State attorney general would be entitled to bring an action under this Act based substantially on the same alleged violation of the antitrust laws or section 7, the Attorney General or Federal Trade Commission, as applicable, shall promptly give written notification thereof to such State attorney general.

"(b) To assist a State attorney general in evaluating the notice described in subsection (a) or in bringing any action under this Act, the Attorney General of the United States or Federal Trade Commission, as applicable, shall, upon request by such State attorney general, make available to the State attorney general, to the extent permitted by law, any investigative files or other materials which are or may be relevant or material to the actual or potential cause of action under this Act.";

(2) in section 5—

(A) in subsection (a) by inserting "(including a proceeding brought by the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7)" after "United States under the antitrust laws"; and

(B) in subsection (i) by inserting "(including a proceeding instituted by the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7)" after "antitrust laws";

(3) in section 11, by adding at the end the following:

"(m)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), in enforcing compliance with section 7, the Federal Trade Commission shall enforce compliance with that section in the same manner as the Attorney General in accordance with section 15.

"(2) If the Federal Trade Commission approves an agreement with the parties to the transaction that contains a consent order with respect to a violation of section 7, the Commission shall enforce compliance with that section in accordance with this section.";

(4) in section 13, by inserting "(including a suit, action, or proceeding brought by the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7)" before "subpoenas"; and

(5) in section 15, by inserting "and the duty of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to a violation of section 7," after "General,".

#### SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT.

The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) is amended—

(1) in section 5(b), by inserting "(excluding the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18), except in cases where the Commission approves an agreement with the parties to the transaction that contains a consent order)" after "unfair method of competition";

(2) in section 9, by inserting after the fourth undesignated paragraph the following:

"Upon the application of the commission with respect to any activity related to the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18) that may result in any unfair method of competition, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus commanding any person or corporation to comply with the provisions of this Act or any order of the commission made in pursuance thereof."

(3) in section 13(b)(1), by inserting "(excluding section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18) and section 5(a)(1) with respect to the consummation of a proposed merger, acquisition, joint venture, or similar transaction that is subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18))" after "Commission"; and

(4) in section 20(c)(1), by inserting "or under section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18), where applicable," after "Act."

#### SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this Act shall not apply to any of the following that occurs before the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) A violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18).

(2) A transaction with respect to which there is compliance with section 7A of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a).

(3) A case in which a preliminary injunction has been filed in a district court of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2745, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 1914, Congress passed the Federal Trade Commission Act, marking the beginning of a dual antitrust enforcement regime in the United States.

Because both the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission enforce our Nation's antitrust laws, companies may and often do have different experiences when interacting with one agency relative to the other.

One area in which the disparity can be the most striking and troubling is in the merger review process. When a company wishes to merge with or pur-

chase another company, it must notify both antitrust enforcement agencies of the proposed transaction.

The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission then determine which agency will be responsible for reviewing the transaction. As there are no fixed rules for making this determination, it can appear that the decision is made on the basis of a flip of the coin.

There are two substantive differences that companies face based on the identity of the antitrust enforcement agency that reviews the company's proposed transaction.

The first difference arises if the agency seeks to prevent the transaction by pursuing a preliminary injunction in Federal court. A different legal standard is applied to a preliminary injunction request based solely on the identity of the requesting antitrust enforcement agency.

The second difference lies in the process available to each antitrust enforcement agency to prevent a transaction from proceeding. The FTC may pursue administrative litigation against a proposed transaction even after a court denies its preliminary injunction request. In contrast, the Department of Justice cannot pursue administrative litigation.

There is no justification for these disparities in the merger review processes and standards. The bipartisan Antitrust Modernization Commission recommended that Congress remove these disparities, and the bill before us today, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act, or SMARTER Act, does just that.

I applaud Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas for introducing this important legislation that will enhance the transparency, predictability, and credibility of the antitrust merger review process.

By enacting the SMARTER Act into law, Congress will ensure that companies no longer will be subjected to fundamentally different processes and standards based on the flip of a coin.

Notably, the legislation has garnered the support of former and current FTC Commissioners, including former Chairman David Clanton, former Commissioner Josh Wright, and sitting Commissioner Maureen Ohlhausen.

The SMARTER Act is an important step toward ensuring that our Nation's antitrust laws are enforced in a manner that is fair, consistent, and predictable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this good government bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called SMARTER Act, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act, which really should—I mean, it is a misnomer.

We should rename this bill. Instead of that, we should rename it the Sadly More Acronyms for Really Terrible and Esoteric Requirements Act.

□ 0945

I know a lot of people around the country are wondering: Well, what is this all about? It must be important that they are doing this.

I will tell you what is important about it. It is a piece of legislation that would impact the largest and most consequential of corporate mergers, of multinational corporate mergers. Those things have to go through a review process with our Federal Trade Commission. Also, the Department of Justice has an antitrust division.

What this piece of legislation would do would be to gut one of the agency's—the FTC's—ability to oversee and deal with merger review issues that affect the largest and most consequential of their mergers, of these big corporate mergers.

Does this piece of legislation benefit the people? Or does it benefit the 1 percent of large multinational corporations that, I guess, need help avoiding regulatory authority by our government?

Well, it looks like that is what it is. It is something that is going to help out big business at a time when people in this country are very angry about the fact that the playing field is not level. The corporations and the wealthy have been doing pretty well over the last couple of generations, but people are seeing their wages stand right there where they were. They are working harder, they are more productive, but yet they can't even take a vacation. They can't even afford to take a day off to see about a sick child.

This is why people are so angry. It is because they look at Congress and they see us doing this kind of work benefiting 1 percent of the largest multinational corporations when there are other things like passing a budget, dealing with the Zika crisis which is unfolding, dealing with the Flint water crisis, dealing with the opioid addiction crisis in this country.

We can't even pass a budget. Here we are going to pass the so-called SMARTER Act today, and then we are going to go home for almost 3 weeks. They call it a district work period, but it is actually a period where folks are out campaigning, trying to retain their seats. People are angry about that.

Congress first established the Federal Trade Commission in 1914 to safeguard consumers against anticompetitive behavior by empowering the Commission with the authority to enforce, clarify, and develop antitrust law. President Woodrow Wilson later described the creation of the Commission as specifically providing for tribunals that would "determine what was fair and what was unfair competition; and to supply the business community not merely with lawyers in the Department of Justice who could cry, 'Stop!', but



with men in such tribunals as the Federal Trade Commission who could say, 'Go on,' who could warn where things were going wrong and assist instead of check."

Today, under the process of administrative litigation, also known as part 3 litigation, the Commission does just that. Under this authority, it may seek permanent injunctions in its own administrative court in addition to its ability to seek preliminary injunctions in Federal District Court. This authority is a unique mechanism that takes advantage of the Commission's longstanding expertise to develop some of the most complex issues in antitrust law.

But the SMARTER Act would upend this century of precedent and expertise by creating a uniform standard for preliminary injunctions in cases involving significant mergers and other transactions and, alarmingly, eliminating the Commission's ability to administratively litigate antitrust cases.

Proponents of the SMARTER Act argue that divergent standards for enjoining mergers may undermine the public's trust in the efficient and fair outcome of merger cases. They also state that the outcome of a transaction comes down to a coin flip between the agencies to determine which will review a transaction. That claim is ridiculous and it is not borne out by the evidence.

The American Antitrust Institute, a consumer-oriented antitrust organization, conducted a lengthy study of workload statistics compiled by both antitrust agencies and found that the concerns of the bill's sponsors are without foundation.

Jonathan Jacobson, a leading antitrust attorney who served on the Antitrust Modernization Commission, testified that in his 39 years of practice, the outcome of a merger has never turned on the differences that the SMARTER Act seeks to address in antitrust law.

Indeed, of the 3 percent of transactions requiring second requests for information from the antitrust agencies, only about 1.5 percent of those cases are stopped or modified. An even smaller percentage of these cases go to trial for an administrative hearing. We should hesitate before making wholesale changes to the law based on theoretical concerns involving about 1 percent of mergers, which also happen to be some of the largest and most consequential.

In the absence of any meaningful evidence suggesting a material difference in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, it is difficult to upending longstanding antitrust practices at the FTC for consistency's sake alone based on speculative harms. But even assuming that there are material differences in cases brought under these standards, we should strike a balance in favor of competition by lowering the burden of proof in cases brought by the Justice Department, not by raising the Commission's burden for obtaining preliminary injunctions.

Courts already require a lower burden of proof in cases brought by the Commission and Justice Department precisely because both are expert agencies equipped with large staffs of economists who analyze numerous mergers on a regular basis and who may only bring cases that are in the public interest. To the extent that we should address perceived differences in the standard for preliminary injunctions in merger cases, legislation should favor increased competition, not the interests of merging parties.

The SMARTER Act would eliminate the FTC's authority to administratively litigate mergers and other transactions under section 5(b) of the FTC Act. Leading authorities in antitrust across party lines have expressed serious reservations with eliminating the Commission's administrative litigation authority.

For instance, Bill Kovacic, a former Republican chair of the Commission, has referred to this aspect of the bill as "rubbish," noting that the Commission has used administrative litigation to win a string of novel antitrust cases that courts have ultimately upheld where the "Commission has had to fight for every single foot along the way."

Edith Ramirez, the chairwoman of the FTC, likewise wrote last Congress that eliminating the FTC's administrative litigation authority would "fundamentally alter the nature and function of the FTC."

Mr. Speaker, 2015 was the year of the merger, megamergers, mergermania. There was over \$3.8 trillion in merger spending, a record that far exceeded expectations. While fewer than 20 percent of mergers raise competition concerns, it is clear that a vote for H.R. 2745 is a vote for concentrated, private economic power. At a time of increased consolidation in key industries, we can't afford more Republican attacks on government, which is what H.R. 2745 is, plain and simple.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee, and the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be here today to be the sponsor of the SMARTER Act.

This is just good government. We have a situation now that if you want to merge your company with another company, you could go before the Federal Trade Commission or you could go before the Department of Justice.

Now, you would think that the Clayton Act that governs antitrust law would say: All right. Well, we are going to get treated the same, no matter which way we go, the law is the law.

But that is not how it works. A big piece of this is the procedural aspect of

it. If your merger is reviewed by the Department of Justice and they have a problem with it and they need a preliminary injunction to stop it, they go to Federal Court before a judge, as the Founding Fathers intended, the executive branch agency, and there is a dispute, and it is litigated in front of a Federal court.

But if you go before the Federal Trade Commission, they could go to Federal court like the Department of Justice, but they can also go to their own court. They have got their own court with an FTC employee as the judge. Now, we have got administrative law courts that work, but they can also do both.

You have got a situation that the merger could be delayed. In these business transactions, as in life, time is money. Just the threat of going through this administrative process has the effect of giving the FTC the ability to extract concessions that the DOJ wouldn't.

Look, we need to be treated fairly no matter which agency reviews it. This is the main gist of the SMARTER Act. Let's make it the same if you go to the DOJ or the FTC.

This isn't just something that we, Republicans, pulled out of our hats. This is a recommendation from the bipartisan Antitrust Modification Commission. They have testified that this is part of what they think needs to be done to make a better, more efficient government.

Listen, nobody wants to be tied up in red tape. As you go through a merger and you draw the short straw and end up in front of the FTC, you have got another spool of red tape that you could very possibly get rolled up in. I don't think that is fair and I don't think the American people think that is fair.

Now, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), says this guts the antitrust laws. It doesn't. It just makes them fairer. It makes the review the same no matter where you go. It is commonsense, good government.

I don't have anything else to say. I don't see how you can be against fairness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the Honorable BILL PASCRELL from New Jersey, who serves on, by the way, the Budget and the Ways and Means Committees here in Congress, I would like to point out that we have got a severe problem that we are confronting this morning. It is the big, bad FTC, which is treating the big multinational corporations unfairly. It is abusing them, and something needs to be done. The American people are demanding it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) so that he can explain further how important this bill is to the American people.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.



This bill is terrible. The Federal Trade Commission is tasked with protecting consumers from anticompetitive mergers. What I just heard from the gentleman is that this is all about getting rid of red tape. Baloney. This is about money, this is about keeping money in your own pocket and protecting yourself against the consumers.

□ 1000

Concessions we are talking about here.

The Federal Trade Commission is tasked with protecting consumers from anticompetitive mergers. That is what the job is. Corporate mergers can make industries more efficient and bring benefits to customers, but in some cases, they have the potential to increase costs and hurt competition. Mr. Speaker, if you deny that, then you don't have the facts, and I am going to lay them out right now.

Government should not be in the business of setting prices for healthcare services or anything else for that matter—for airline tickets, cable Internet services, or anything else. I hope we agree on that. That is why we need to rely on robust market competition—to keep the prices of goods and services down and ensure that consumers are getting a fair deal.

I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, with due respect, that we are pretty good fans of competition; yet here we are, after Bloomberg dubbed 2015 the “Year of the Mergers,” weakening a key FTC tool to ensure healthy competition in a variety of markets.

Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly concerned with this issue, and I mentioned four areas here. I am very, very concerned about the mergers we have seen in many sectors of the healthcare industry. Read my lips: look at the facts through the Speaker. In my left hand, a recent report by the Health Care Pricing Project, which was written up in *The New York Times* late last year, found that monopoly hospitals have prices that are 15.3 percent higher than hospitals in an area with four or more hospitals—even after controlling for costs in each area.

Don't you really believe in competition, or do you just say that? Is that simply a bumper sticker, a slogan, or do you mean that?

Two pending mergers in the insurance industry, between Anthem and Cigna and Aetna and Humana, set the stage for major consolidation in this industry as well. In other words, what this report did was establish the fact—I hope you are interested in the facts—that the reason we have increasing healthcare costs—a major reason—is for the merger and the reduction in competition in health care.

Then there are the mergers that are motivated by U.S. tax dodging. Mr. Speaker, and we have talked about this, which have major implications on competition but also on the United States tax base. One pending merger would see a major United States com-

pany slash its United States tax bill by moving its headquarters overseas and creating the largest drug company in the universe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1½ minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Working Americans across the country do not have the benefit of hiring consultants, of shifting their earned income around the globe to find the lowest tax rate. And you are standing there, saying you want to help the consumer? It is just the opposite.

Many multinational corporations do just that. Corporate inversions allow companies to renege on the obligation to America, eroding the United States tax base and hurting American competitiveness. Who are you with anyway? If you live in a neighborhood and one house—let's say the biggest house on the block—doesn't pay its property taxes, what happens? Everyone understands that the rest of the houses on the block have to make up the difference.

The Treasury has taken steps to address inversions, but it is up to Congress to pass legislation that addresses this problem immediately. In the meantime, the bill before us today would weaken the FTC's ability to monitor and enforce against unfair, anticompetitive mergers, and they are all over the place. I blame, partially, the administration, as the former Attorney General did nothing about mergers. While people were trying to get him to resign for other reasons, that would have been a darned good reason.

This is not Republican or Democrat, my friends. These are simply the facts, and I can tell you this one report will very, very much crystallize what those facts are.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's commitment to the free market, because I think we all believe a free and fair market is in the best interest of America and in the best interest of every American consumer, but we have got to take a look at the procedure.

This is, primarily, procedural in nature so that those companies that are seeking mergers, whether they go through the FTC or through the Department of Justice, are simply treated the same. If the gentleman is concerned about the fact that there are too many mergers—that we are getting bigger and bigger companies and that it is stifling competition—that is a legitimate conversation for us to have in the context of changing the law with respect to monopolies, mergers, and acquisitions.

What we are trying to do here is not change that law, but make that law

fairer and applied equally, regardless of whether one is in front of the Department of Justice or whether one is in front of the Federal Trade Commission. If the gentleman takes that argument, then he is saying, right now, the FTC has an advantage in stopping these mergers because it has all of these other procedures in place, as opposed to the Department of Justice.

Why should one get stuck with a tougher row to hoe based on which agency one goes in front of? That is just not fair.

Mr. PASCRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, what we need to understand is that we are not only talking about the FTC, we are talking about the Justice Department, which oversees these mergers regardless of whether we are talking about health or airlines, which is a catastrophe. I only brought up health care today. We are having that discussion you just talked about.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. In reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman has a problem with the fact that there are so many mergers and that he thinks it is anticompetitive and not good for folks. That is an opinion that the gentleman is, certainly, entitled to, but that is, I think, out of the scope of what this bill is trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, this bill takes existing law and says, look, let's apply it the same regardless of which agency one is before. I think that is the difference there. I would be happy to meet with the gentleman in his office and see if we can find some ways that we can agree so that we might reform the overall antitrust system.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am mainly concerned about this piece of legislation because you have determined—you have defined—a non-existent problem while applying a less consumer friendly standard. That is my position.

What I brought up here is part of the mix. It is putting it in context as to what has happened. The consequences of what has happened are higher prices for us—for you and me—and I know you are concerned about that.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. In reclaiming my time, my point is that, if the gentleman thinks we have too many mergers, let's change the law, but let's have a fair procedure. What this bill is designed to do is to have a fair procedure for those who are engaged in that activity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend from Texas.

We went through a period of time in the first decade of this century of U.S.

prosecutors and attorneys looking at the subject of deferred prosecutions. I am talking about justice here. That is the bottom line. That is what we are talking about here.

Instead of bringing corporations to trial that had violated the law—and I am not an attorney. I am not the reason for two of my sons being attorneys, but I am not an attorney—they worked out a proposition. This is what they are trying to do, and this is what this is all about, if I could draw a comparison, which is you slap a corporation on the wrist, it pays a fine, and the fine becomes the cost of doing business.

Mr. Speaker, this is going in the wrong direction. It is attacking a problem that does not exist instead of attacking a problem that does exist.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am anguished in listening to the pleas of my friend from Texas to help these megamergers, to help these big, multinational corporations. They need us so badly because the big, bad FTC is treating them too tough. It is too rough on them. Therefore, we have to make the law fairer for them. They have all of these silk stocking lawyers off of Wall Street, but we need to help them. We are not doing anything else here in Congress other than helping multinational corporations, hearing the plea that these folks need help when it is the folks in Flint, Michigan, who need help, who are crying out for help, but their voices can't be heard in this Congress because we are too busy trying to protect these big, multinational corporations.

The only thing we want to do, according to my friends, is to harmonize the standard of proof between the DOJ and the FTC so that the big, bad corporations which need our help only have to deal with one standard of proof. They are not telling you what they are really wanting to do, which is to gut administrative review by the FTC, under section 5(b) of the FTC Act. That is where the real harm comes in, but they don't want to tell you about that. They don't want to let you know what kind of impact that has when a prescription drug company seeks to merge again with another large company and make a humongous company that is too big to fail and, also, too big to regulate your drug prices out there.

Why are your drug prices going up? What kind of policies are we implementing here in Congress to protect them? Absolutely none. We are making it easier for prices to go up with insurance, in the travel industry, in trying to get a hotel. In trying to book a hotel room on the Internet, they have got it all rigged up because there are only a couple of companies you can go through to get the room.

These are the policies that are affecting the lives of the people whom we represent. I don't represent many big,

multinational corporations. I don't think I have any, as a matter of fact, in my district, but I guess there are some folks around here who have a bunch of them.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, since I have one speaker remaining, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and I thank the chairman of the full committee and the author of this bill.

I rise in combination of speaking on this bill, but also offering my deepest sympathy to the people of Brussels, the people of Belgium which, some would say, is the heart of the civic participation of Europe—they are certainly dear friends of the United States—though we would mourn any who have been impacted by the dastardly deeds of terrorism.

I know in our committee, Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. GOODLATTE are working on these issues. I would hope that we could move the no fly for foreign terrorists bill as quickly as possible as we make our way through these issues of determining how we disrupt the ideology and then the actions that result in the deaths of innocent persons. So I offer that.

Mr. Speaker, I am struck by the name of this bill because I don't know who gets smarter. I know that the consumers get poorer and that there are opportunities for victimizing the consumers. This bill does not create equal rules or implement smarter legislation.

But if I might take up the comment about the increasing cost of prescription drugs, that is clearly a result of not allowing the FTC to pursue and to proceed because it is our arm of equalizing and balancing the consumer.

On this day, when we acknowledge the sixth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act that has brought health insurance to 20 million people, we know that what we need to fix is the rising cost of prescription drugs.

So this bill is about attacking the administrative authority of the Federal Trade Commission. It is an unnecessary measure that would fundamentally undermine the FTC's independent enforcement authority and ability to prevent anticompetitive mergers.

As a law student, I remember in my antitrust classes how the FTC was highlighted as one of the anchors of balance and the anchors of protection of innocent civilians.

Specifically, if enacted, the SMARTER Act would strip the FTC of power by eliminating the agency's authority to enforce antitrust laws in larger merger cases and by blocking its ability to use its administrative proceedings to stop a harmful merger transaction.

Why is that? The FTC is where you can engage and have discussion. The bill seeks to do so by requiring that the FTC use the same enforcement process as the DOJ. There is more ability for the little guy to be heard at the FTC.

This proposed sweeping change undercuts the FTC's administrative litigation process for contested mergers or acquisitions and effectively removes a very core and functioning character of the agency, lets more people in the door to express themselves for or against this merger, how it impacts, with less resources needed to get in front of an administrative agency than dealing with the Department of Justice.

Moreover, reducing the FTC's independence directly conflicts with Congress' intent in creating this antitrust enforcement agency and policymaking body as a distinct and independent shield from political and executive interference.

As enforcers of section 7 of the Clayton Act, both the FTC and DOJ have the authority and responsibility to prohibit mergers and acquisitions that substantially lessen competition. That saves money because competition helps save money. These agencies serve to complement each other. Why make them the same? They are not twins.

Based upon historical experience and coordinated development, the FTC serves to protect consumers and consumer spending, health care, pharmaceuticals, professional services, food, energy, food safety, among other things. The DOJ typically assumes a specialized focus on larger corporate industries, like telecommunications, banks, railroads, and airlines. Serving as joint enforcement agencies for over 100 years, they work together.

Don't take away the consumers' arm. That is the FTC. This bill takes it away and puts the little guy under and the big guy up.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2745, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews through Equal Rules Act—otherwise known as the SMARTER Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not about creating equal rules or implementing "smarter" legislation.

Rather, it is about attacking the administrative authority of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

H.R. 2745 is an unnecessary measure that would fundamentally undermine the FTC's independent enforcement authority and ability to prevent anti-competitive mergers.

As we all know, the FTC was created by Congress with the specific intent of creating an independent antitrust enforcement agency and supplemental authority to the Department of Justice (DOJ).

Specifically, if enacted, the SMARTER Act would strip the FTC of its power by eliminating

the agency's authority to enforce antitrust laws in larger merger cases, and by blocking its ability to use its administrative proceedings to stop a harmful merger transaction.

The bill seeks to do so by requiring that the FTC use the same enforcement process as the DOJ.

This proposed sweeping change undercuts the FTC's administrative litigation process for contested mergers or acquisitions and effectively removes the very core and functioning character of this agency.

Moreover, reducing the FTC's independence directly conflicts with Congress's intent in creating this antitrust enforcement agency and policymaking body as distinct and independent shield from political and executive interference.

As enforcers of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, both the FTC and the DOJ have the authority and responsibility to prohibit mergers and acquisitions that would "substantially lessen competition" or "tend to create a monopoly".

Under this enforcement authority, these agencies serve to complement each other, and have developed over the years to specialize in particular industries and markets.

Based upon historical experience and coordinated developments, the FTC serves to protect consumers and consumer spending—e.g., healthcare, pharmaceuticals, professional services, food, energy, and certain high-tech industries like computer technology and internet services.

Whereas, the DOJ typically assumes a specialized focus on larger corporate industries—e.g., telecommunications, banks, railroads, and airlines.

Thus, while the FTC and the DOJ have operated with a shared responsibility of enforcing federal antitrust laws, these two federal agencies are unique and each retain exclusive authority of certain conduct.

Serving as joint enforcement agencies for over 100 years, the FTC and DOJ rely upon each other to coordinate agency jurisdiction and harmonized standards and practices.

The SMARTER Act is simply unnecessary as it fails to put forth any meaningful effort to enhance or rectify any expressed concerns governing these longstanding agency operations.

In particular, in 2002 Congress sought to review and amend antitrust laws and policies in light of changing economy and rise in technological advances.

In 2007 a report issued by the Antitrust Modernization Commission (AMC) set forth specific recommendations for the FTC to eliminate real or perceived disparities in the review process for merger transactions.

According to the AMC, Congress should seek to ensure that the same or comparable standard is used when seeking a preliminary injunction against a potentially anticompetitive transaction.

However, the SMARTER Act goes beyond this recommendation and seeks to chip away and carve out the entire administrative adjudication authority of the FTC.

In order to identify potential violations of the Clayton Act, the FTC and the DOJ review proposed merger transactions pursuant to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act (the HSR Act), which provides advance notice and sets forth guidelines on large merger and acquisition transactions.

The heart of this concern is the alternate means in which the FTC and the DOJ carry out their enforcement role during this HSR pre-merger process.

Namely, H.R. 2745 is curiously motivated by the preliminary injunction process utilized by the FTC and the DOJ to halt proposed transactions that would violate the Clayton Act if completed.

Additionally, the DOJ typically consolidates the preliminary and permanent injunction proceedings, while the FTC typically only pursues the preliminary injunction.

While some argue that proposed transactions reviewed through the FTC would be treated more leniently than those reviewed through the DOJ, this assertion was not fully substantiated by the AMC.

The pre-merger review process and the injunction standards utilized by the FTC and the DOJ are the very procedural steps that characterize and distinguish the respective enforcement roles of these agencies.

This supposed area of concern addresses only a small fraction of proposed transactions, as the vast majority of merger and acquisition proposals are found to not be in violation of the Clayton Act during the review process.

The FTC and the DOJ review over a thousand merger filings every year.

Yet 95% of those merger filings present no competitive issues or challenged transactions.

As reported by the American Antitrust Institute (AAI), the overall concerns purported by the bill's sponsors are simply without foundation.

In contrast, the overall work of the FTC has an incredible impact on American consumers, communities and corporations and will be severely impacted if disrupted.

As highlighted by the FTC Chairwoman Edith Ramirez in her testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, the FTC prioritizes the protection of consumers and the prevention of anticompetitive market practices.

In fact, the FTC exists to ensure fair competition and to prevent enormous concentrations of economic power that hurts consumers and small businesses.

For example:

In the past year, the FTC has challenged over 28 mergers, (although in most it was able to negotiate a remedy to allow the merger to proceed).

At the consumer level in my home state of Texas, the FTC secured an \$82,000 settlement against an auto-dealer found in violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act in September 2015.

Also last year, the FTC ordered the largest divestiture ever in a supermarket merger, requiring Albertsons and Safeway to sell 168 supermarkets in 130 local markets throughout several states, ensuring that communities continue to benefit from competition among their local supermarkets.

The FTC has also taken an aggressive stance on stopping anticompetitive mergers and conduct in the healthcare market by halting such practices through administrative litigation.

In September 2015, the FTC secured a \$1.1 million settlement to consumers who lost money to a health insurance telemarketing scam.

And in the last two years, the FTC took action in 13 pharmaceutical mergers, ordering

divestitures to preserve competition for drugs that treat diabetes, hypertension, and cancer, as well as widely used generic medications like oral contraceptives and antibiotics.

Just last week on March 18, 2016, after a thoroughly vetted investigation, the FTC approved a final order preserving competition among outpatient dialysis clinics in Laredo, Texas.

That is, the FTC cleared U.S. Renal Care, Inc.'s (the country's third largest outpatient dialysis provider) \$640 million purchase of dialysis competitor DSI Renal, on the condition that three of DSI's outpatient clinics in Laredo, Texas, be handed over to a third party. Absent this agreed divestiture, the acquisition would have led to a significant increase in market concentration and anti-competitive effects. The likely result, according to the FTC, would have included the elimination of direct competition between U.S. Renal Care and DSI Renal, reduced incentives to improve services or quality for dialysis patients, and increased ability for the merged company to unilaterally increase prices.

Notably, the DOJ has also been successful in securing investigations and halting suspected harmful merger practices on a much larger scale (in the health care and airline industry as of recent).

In June 2015, the DOJ put pressure on several multibillion dollar health insurers seeking to engage in large merger transactions with near certain suppression of market competition in the healthcare industry.

In August 2015, the DOJ issued civil investigative demands on several major US airlines seeking to halt any potential unlawful mergers.

These cases demonstrate the need for continued protection of the FTC and its ability to effectively carry out injunctions on harmful merger and acquisition activities, as well as anticompetitive business conduct that harms consumers and restrains market activity.

The ability of the FTC to function independently is a necessary function to the success of both the FTC and the DOJ.

The far-reaching and elusive SMARTER Act fails keep the foundational integrity of these agencies and should be opposed.

I urge all Members to vote against this serious threat to our fundamental protections of consumers and fair economic competition.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

It is not often that I come to the floor to argue a bill and to debate and nobody on the other side shows up to participate in the debate. I have been feeling kind of lonely over here.

I guess that people are too embarrassed on the other side to come here and defend this legislation at this particular time, as we get ready to depart for what will be just about 3 weeks, while we are leaving dangling and hanging important issues, like a budget for this country that was promised to us back at the beginning of the year. It was supposed to be regular order. It was supposed to be that we are going to do a budget.

After the budget is done and we have our top lines and bottom lines in place, then we will embark upon the appropriations process and we will pass all of

the 12 appropriations bills for the first time in years and we will get back to regular order around here. They can't even produce enough votes to pass a budget.

So what do we do then? We revert to trying to protect and coddle and make things easy for big multinational corporations that want to get bigger. They want to get bigger so that they can get a lock on the market, they have no competition, and then they can set whatever price they want to set and the American people are left having to pay.

What can you do when you need your prescription medication and there is no competition, no other similar drug, and you only have one player in the room; therefore, you have to pay whatever they are holding you over the barrel for.

The American people are sick and tired and they are angry about having been held over a barrel year after year after year as this Congress continues to coddle and protect and make things good for big business.

Well, what about the working people of this country? When are we going to do something about making sure that they don't have to pay these increased bills that they would have to pay for things like hotel rooms, insurance, medical care, prescription drugs, nursing homes, and food?

I don't even want to talk about the price of gas that is going to go up this summer. Despite the fact that we have a glut in the oil market, you are going to be seeing your gas prices rise. Why? Because you are getting out on the road and trying to go on vacation. It is getting more and more difficult to do that because wages haven't gone up.

So this Congress continues to make it easy for big corporations to increase their profits while doing nothing to raise wages for the regular working people of this country.

Now we are getting ready to go on another 3-week district work period. I have a lot of work to do in the district trying to explain to the people of my district why we are not getting down to business and doing the things that they expect this Congress to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues in this body oppose the SMARTER Act and do what is right for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let's look at the arguments, the straw men that have been set up by the other party claiming that this legislation does a manner of things that it simply does not do.

First, they say enacting the SMARTER Act only benefits large companies that wish to merge, but the SMARTER Act protects small and midsize companies which also come under the Federal Trade Commission's scrutiny.

This legislation is not designed to help big companies get bigger. Indeed,

large companies have the resources to hire the lawyers, economists, lobbyists, and other regulatory professionals to wrestle with the FTC.

It is the small- and medium-size companies that would benefit from a fair process and an assurance that they would have their day in court.

The FTC does not always focus its attention on the large companies. In fact, a Wall Street Journal article from 2013 documents how the FTC pursued anti-competitive practices of the Music Teachers National Association, a nonprofit with about a dozen employees.

In short, this nonprofit was a collection of piano teachers. So if you think the FTC only engages with conglomerates, you are mistaken. They will even prosecute your after-school piano teacher.

The SMARTER Act ensures that, if the FTC does focus its efforts on piano teachers, on the small- and medium-size companies, they will have the benefit of a fair process.

Then they make the argument that the SMARTER Act will make it more difficult for antitrust enforcement agencies to stop a merger, but the SMARTER Act only changes the process. It does not have any substantive impact on merger reviews.

The SMARTER Act does not make any substantive changes to antitrust law. Rather, the legislation only standardizes the process between the two antitrust enforcement agencies.

The witnesses at the committee hearings on the SMARTER Act testified that the legislation only affects the process and not the substantive standard.

As Deborah Garza, former chairwoman of the Antitrust Modernization Commission stated:

No one on the AMC believed at the time, and I do not believe today, that this legislation would make it difficult or impossible for the FTC Commission to do its job. The Justice Department has done very well in pursuing its merger enforcement agenda working with the standards that apply to it. And I firmly believe that the FTC can do so as well.

Indeed, even the current Department of Justice Assistant Attorney General for the antitrust division stated:

I do not think there is a practical difference in how the courts assess the factual and legal basis for enjoining a merger challenged by the FTC on the one hand and the Department on the other.

Let me also quote from a letter written by 15 leading antitrust professors who wrote to Congress expressing their support for the SMARTER Act:

The FTC is a very impressive agency that plays a valuable role in antitrust enforcement. The SMARTER Act does nothing to undermine the FTC's authority. It simply ensures that the merger review processes and standards are equally applied to merger parties, regardless of which agency reviews the transaction.

The gentleman from New Jersey complained about what was going on with the review of proposed mergers by health insurance companies. Guess

what. Who is doing those reviews? Not the FTC. The Department of Justice. It doesn't make any sense.

What does make sense is that there are lots of companies going through lots of things caused, in part, by ObamaCare forcing healthcare providers, insurance companies, and others to look at mergers and acquisitions. When they do so, the public should have the right to know that justice is being done.

This is not about big business or small business. This is about making sure that the laws are fairly and equally applied. When that happens, we should have this legislation at hand so that we have the assurance that we are going to have justice done. The FTC should operate by the same merger review processes and standards that the Department of Justice does.

I believe in the vigorous prosecution of antitrust practices and transactions by the Department of Justice and the FTC. I would not support the SMARTER Act if I thought that it would disadvantage our antitrust enforcement agencies.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD demonstrates that the SMARTER Act only makes the process more fair and predictable while providing the antitrust enforcement agencies with the same powers to prosecute antitrust practices.

□ 1030

The SMARTER Act is a common-sense process reform that ensures fairness and parity in the narrow field of merger reviews. The bill was recommended to Congress by a bipartisan commission and is supported by former top Department of Justice antitrust enforcement officials and past and present FTC Commissioners of both political parties.

This legislation will help America continue to serve as a leader and innovator in competition law, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2745, the "Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act of 2015" or SMARTER Act, would require the Federal Trade Commission to use the same merger enforcement procedures as the Justice Department's Antitrust Division for proposed mergers, acquisitions, joint ventures, and other similar transactions.

I oppose this flawed bill for several reasons.

Most importantly, H.R. 2745—by weakening the Commission's independence—undermines Congress's original intent in creating the Federal Trade Commission in the first place.

For good reasons that are still relevant today, Congress established the Commission to be an independent administrative agency.

Although the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 empowered the Justice Department to enforce antitrust laws, Congress determined that more needed to be done to address the wave of mergers and anti-competitive corporate abuses that continued notwithstanding the enactment of that Act.

Accordingly, Congress created the Commission in 1914 as an independent body of experts charged with developing antitrust law and policy free from political influence, and particularly executive branch interference.

To this end, Congress specifically gave the Commission broad administrative powers to investigate and enforce laws to stop unfair methods of competition as well as the authority to use an administrative adjudication process to develop policy expertise, rather than requiring the Commission to try cases before a generalist federal judge.

Yet, rather than strengthening the Commission's independence and enforcement authority, the SMARTER Act does the opposite.

Of greatest concern is the bill's elimination of the administrative adjudication process for merger cases under section 5(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

By doing so, the SMARTER Act would effectively transform the Commission from an independent administrative agency into just another competition enforcement agency indistinguishable from the Justice Department and, thereby, arguable redundant.

The Commission's administrative authority is key to its distinctive role as an independent administrative agency. But the SMARTER Act—by eliminating the Commission's administrative authority—opens the door for the ultimate elimination of the Commission.

And, you do not just have to take my word for it. Former Republican Commission Chairman William Kovacic, while expressing support for the bill's harmonization of preliminary injunction standards, says that the "rest of the SMARTER Act is rubbish."

He continued, "Let me put it this way: behind the rest of [the SMARTER Act] is the fundamental question of whether you want the Federal Trade Commission involved in competition law."

Similarly, current Commission Chairwoman Edith Ramirez observes that the bill would have "far-reaching immediate effects" and "fundamentally alter the nature and function of the Commission, as well as the potential for significant unintended consequences."

Consumers Union also opposes the SMARTER Act not only because it is completely unnecessary, but also because the bill could "create unintended hurdles to effective and sound enforcement" and "set the stage for further tinkering—both of which risk undermining what is now a coherent, consistent, well-established, familiar enforcement procedure within the" Commission.

Finally, the SMARTER Act is problematic because it may apply to conduct well-beyond large mergers, which could further hinder the Commission's effectiveness.

In particular, the SMARTER Act would eliminate the Commission's authority to use administrative adjudications not just for the largest mergers, but for non-merger activity, like a "joint venture" or "similar transaction."

I recognize that the bill's authors have tried in good faith to respond to some of the concerns expressed by me and by the Commission during the last Congress and I appreciate those efforts.

Moreover, I recognize that the Commission itself last year changed its procedural rules to make it easier to end the use of administrative litigation where it loses a preliminary injunction proceeding in court.

I continue to have concerns, however, about the bill's prohibition against the Commission's

administrative litigation authority with respect to all merger cases.

Accordingly, I must oppose the SMARTER Act, even in its rewritten form, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 2745.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 653, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DOGGETT. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Doggett moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 2745) to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### SEC. 5. PROTECTING CONSUMERS AGAINST HIGH PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS.

(a) This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to mergers that would unreasonably increase the costs of pharmaceutical drugs.

(b) The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C.12 et seq.) and Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45 et seq.) as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act shall apply to mergers that would unreasonably increase the costs of pharmaceutical drugs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for many months now so many of us Democrats here in the House have been pleading with our Republican colleagues to recognize that there is a very serious cost to the American people of prescription price gouging; such a serious matter that, overwhelmingly, in the fall, when the Kaiser Family Foundation surveyed healthcare concerns of Americans, the number one issue was soaring, unaffordable prescription drugs.

We have not been very successful in getting their attention on this just to recognize the severity of the problem—not even getting to the point of agreeing on what legislative action this Congress, this administration might take in order to address this problem.

We got another indication of the severity of the problem and the way that people across America are being impacted by the Republican failure to address prescription price gouging in the latest survey done this year by AARP, their RxPrice Watch report, which found the average retail price among 622 prescription medicines that are widely used by seniors more than doubled from less than \$6,000 in 2006 to

over \$11,000 in 2013. That is an incredible increase.

It is not just seniors who are impacted, but working families, people all over the United States, by the fact that prescription drug prices are rising much faster than the cost of living and other health care.

Now, we have been asking for months that Republicans recognize the severity of this problem. I have asked in the Committee on Ways and Means. We cannot even get a hearing on the subject.

Our colleagues have asked, in the Commerce Committee, how about a hearing to look at what is happening to the American people on these outrageous prescription price increases that just keep increasing and increasing? The Commerce Committee has refused to hold a hearing on it.

The Committee on Appropriations has been asked to review and consider this problem. They won't hold a hearing on it.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, under the leadership of ELIJAH CUMMINGS as the ranking Democrat, asked for a subpoena. Finally—and it is appropriate for this bill, they call it the SMARTER Act, and Republicans are always so much better at naming their legislation than what is in it—we had a smart aleck who got subpoenaed, the guy who thought it was okay to raise the price of an over 60-year-old drug by over 5,000 percent in 1 day, having a big impact on people who needed it for reduced immunity from any number of kinds of treatments, a 5,000 percent increase, and they at least were willing to get him over video to make his various smart-aleck remarks about his ability to do that.

Competition by itself is not solving the problem with the soaring cost of prescription drugs. But trying to maintain competition, if Republicans won't recognize how endangered so many Americans are by prescription price gouging, we ought not to go backwards, and that is what I fear this bill would do.

Let me give you a precise example. On November 18, the Federal Trade Commission, which would be impacted by this bill, approved a final order that was concerned with the merger on generic drugs that treat certain types of ulcers and thyroid conditions. This is the merger, an \$8 billion merger between Endo International and Par Pharmaceuticals.

The FTC was concerned about the effect on competition and raising prices and gouging consumers even more than is occurring already. I do not want to impair in any way their ability to initiate litigation, to be involved, to see that competition remains—to the limited extent it is now—and not see seniors or working families with a sick child or anyone who gets a sad diagnosis of a life-threatening disease and then finds themselves facing financial ruin even if they have insurance, to see

one of the few tools we have to deal with these anticompetitive provisions eliminated by this bill.

This is the last amendment on the bill. It will not send the bill back to committee. It will at least preserve this one narrow area. If Republicans won't recognize the problem, at least don't go make it worse.

They could be bringing up bills to this floor like the one that had bipartisan support about 8 or 9 years ago. Former Representative John Dingell had a bill so that we would begin to have Medicare negotiate prices with these pharmaceutical companies. Twenty-four Republicans even joined us. That is the kind of bipartisan action we need.

At least approve this motion to recommit. Let the bill move forward, but without gouging consumers on prescription drug prices even more than they are today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that, because of ObamaCare and government regulation, the cost of prescription drugs is going up—and going up too fast. We definitely need to reform our healthcare system, starting with repealing ObamaCare and putting in place real patient-centered reforms to our healthcare system, but that is not what this legislation is about today.

The SMARTER Act is predicated on a very simple notion: the results of an antitrust merger review should not be dependent on which antitrust enforcement agency happens to review the deal. The outcome should not be determined by the flip of an agency coin. The SMARTER Act is a process reform that ensures that all parties have their day in court and are subject to the same standards, regardless of which antitrust enforcement agency reviews their merger.

The motion to recommit defeats this simple reform by carving out an exception for one area. Why, if we are seeking justice, why, if we are seeking a fair standard for all people before these antitrust review agencies, would we take this particular area and say, no, we are not going to have a consistent standard for reviewing something that the gentleman feels is so important.

We all feel that is very important, and that is why we all should oppose this motion to recommit and vote for the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 658.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 174, nays 235, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—174

Adams	Gabbard	Moore
Aguilar	Gallego	Moulton
Beatty	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Graham	Napolitano
Beyer	Grayson	Neal
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Nolan
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Norcross
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Pallone
Bustos	Hastings	Pascarell
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Payne
Capps	Higgins	Pelosi
Capuano	Himes	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Pingree
Carney	Honda	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Polis
Cartwright	Huffman	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Israel	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Jackerson Lee	Rice (NY)
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Rush
Clay	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Keating	Sanchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	T.
Cohen	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Kildee	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kind	Schiff
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Courtney	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Langevin	Scott, David
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cummings	Larsen (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lee	Sires
DeFazio	Levin	Slaughter
DeGette	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Takai
DeLauro	Lipinski	Takano
DelBene	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Titus
Dingell	Lowe	Tonko
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Torres
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Tsongas
F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Van Hollen
Duckworth	(NM)	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Veasey
Edwards	Maloney,	Vela
Ellison	Carolyn	Velázquez
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Visclosky
Eshoo	Matsui	Walz
Esty	McCollum	Wasserman
Farr	McDermott	Schultz
Fattah	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Foster	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Welch
Fudge	Meng	Yarmuth

NAYS—235

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Burgess
Aderholt	Blackburn	Byrne
Allen	Blum	Calvert
Amash	Bost	Carter (GA)
Amodei	Boustany	Carter (TX)
Ashford	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Babin	Brat	Clawson (FL)
Barletta	Bridenstine	Coffman
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Benishek	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Bera	Buck	Comstock
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Conaway

Cook	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Costello (PA)	Joyce	Rigell
Cramer	Katko	Roby
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Roe (TN)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Davis, Rodney	Kinzing (IL)	Rokita
Denham	Kline	Rooney (FL)
Dent	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	LaHood	Roskam
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Ross
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Rothfus
Dold	Lance	Rouzer
Donovan	Latta	Royce
Duffy	LoBiondo	Russell
Duncan (SC)	Long	Salmon
Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Sanford
Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Schweikert
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Fleischmann	MacArthur	Sessions
Fleming	Marchant	Shimkus
Flores	Marino	Shuster
Forbes	Massie	Simpson
Fortenberry	McCarthy	Sinema
Fox	McCaul	Smith (MO)
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Garrett	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Gibbs	McMorris	Stefanik
Gibson	Rodgers	Stewart
Goodlatte	McSally	Stivers
Gosar	Meadows	Stutzman
Gowdy	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Granger	Messer	Thornberry
Graves (GA)	Mica	Tiberi
Graves (LA)	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)	Trott
Griffith	Moolenaar	Turner
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Upton
Guinta	Mullin	Valadao
Guthrie	Mulvaney	Wagner
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Hardy	Neugebauer	Walden
Harper	Newhouse	Walker
Harris	Nunes	Walorski
Hartzler	Olson	Walters, Mimi
Heck (NV)	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Hensarling	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen	Wenstrup
Hill	Pearce	Westerman
Holding	Perry	Westmoreland
Hudson	Peters	Whitfield
Huelskamp	Peterson	Williams
Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)
Hultgren	Pitts	Wittman
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Womack
Hurd (TX)	Poliquin	Woodall
Hurt (VA)	Pompeo	Yoder
Issa	Posey	Yoho
Jenkins (KS)	Price, Tom	Young (AK)
Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe	Young (IA)
Johnson (OH)	Reed	Young (IN)
Johnson, Sam	Renacci	Zeldin
Jolly	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—24

Bass	Gohmert	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Grijalva	Richmond
Black	Herrera Beutler	Scalise
Blumenauer	Labrador	Smith (WA)
Boyle, Brendan	Love	Speier
F.	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Brown (FL)	Noem	Zinke
Chaffetz	Nugent	
Fincher	Rangel	

□ 1100

Messrs. LAMALFA, ASHFORD, LANCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. SCHWEIKERT, FRANKS of Arizona, DUFFY, BERA, WESTMORELAND, MACARTHUR, and FITZPATRICK changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. NOLAN, DEUTCH, and DOGGETT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.



The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 171, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

## AYES—235

Abraham	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Aderholt	Griffith	Perry
Allen	Grothman	Peters
Amash	Guinta	Pittenger
Amodeli	Guthrie	Pitts
Babin	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hardy	Poliquin
Barr	Harper	Pompeo
Barton	Harris	Posey
Benishek	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Renacci
Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Ribble
Blum	Hill	Rice (SC)
Bost	Holding	Rigell
Boustany	Hudson	Roby
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Rokita
Buchanan	Hurt (VA)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Royce
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Russell
Chabot	Joyce	Salmon
Clawson (FL)	Katko	Sanford
Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Sessions
Comstock	Kinzing (IL)	Shimkus
Conaway	Kline	Shuster
Cook	Knight	Simpson
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Sinema
Cramer	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lance	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Latta	Smith (TX)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Stefanik
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Stivers
Denham	Lucas	Stutzman
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Lummis	Thornberry
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Tipton
Dold	Marino	Trott
Donovan	Massie	Turner
Duffy	McCarthy	Upton
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Valadao
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Wagner
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walden
Farenthold	McMorris	Walker
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walorski
Fleischmann	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Flores	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Messer	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Mica	Westerman
Fox	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Williams
Garamendi	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mullin	Wittman
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Womack
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Yoder
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Gosar	Nunes	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Olson	Young (IN)
Granger	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Palmer	
Graves (LA)	Paulsen	

## NOES—171

Adams	Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Gallego	Napolitano
Ashford	Graham	Neal
Beatty	Grayson	Nolan
Becerra	Green, Al	Norcross
Bera	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pascarell
Bonamici	Hastings	Payne
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bustos	Himes	Pingree
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Pocan
Capps	Honda	Polis
Capuano	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Quigley
Carney	Israel	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cartwright	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kaptur	Rush
Clark (MA)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kennedy	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kind	Schakowsky
Connelly	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Conyers	Kuster	Schrader
Cooper	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Crowley	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lee	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lipinski	Takai
Delaney	Loebsock	Takano
DeLauro	Loftgren	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lowe	Titus
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
Dingell	(NM)	Torres
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Van Hollen
F.	Lynch	Vargas
Duckworth	Maloney,	Veasey
Edwards	Carolyn	Vela
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Engel	Matsui	Visclosky
Eshoo	McCollum	Walz
Esty	McDermott	Wasserman
Farr	McGovern	Schultz
Fattah	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Welch
Fudge	Moulton	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—27

Bass	Grijalva	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Black	Johnson (GA)	Scalise
Blumenauer	Labrador	Smith (WA)
Boyle, Brendan	Love	Speier
F.	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Yoho
Chaffetz	Noem	Zinke
Chu, Judy	Nugent	
Fincher	Rangel	

□ 1106

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 137, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 137 for passage of H.R. 2745 which took place on Wednesday, March 23, 2016, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained at the Supreme Court. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 137 for passage of H.R. 2745.

Stated against:

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 137, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST  
ATTACKS IN BRUSSELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 658) condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Brussels on March 22, 2016, which murdered more than 30 innocent people, and severely wounded many more, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

## YEAS—409

Abraham	Conyers	Gibson
Adams	Cook	Gohmert
Aderholt	Cooper	Goodlatte
Aguilar	Costa	Gosar
Allen	Costello (PA)	Gowdy
Amash	Courtney	Graham
Amodeli	Cramer	Granger
Ashford	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Babin	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Crowley	Graves (MO)
Barr	Cuellar	Grayson
Barton	Culberson	Green, Al
Beatty	Cummings	Green, Gene
Becerra	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Grothman
Bera	Davis, Danny	Guinta
Beyer	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hahn
Bishop (MI)	Delaney	Hanna
Blackburn	DeLauro	Hardy
Blum	DeBene	Harper
Bonamici	Denham	Harris
Bost	Dent	Hartzler
Boustany	DeSantis	Hastings
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Heck (NV)
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Heck (WA)
Brat	Deutch	Hensarling
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (AL)	Dingell	Higgins
Brooks (IN)	Doggett	Hill
Brownley (CA)	Dold	Himes
Buchanan	Donovan	Hinojosa
Buck	Doyle, Michael	Holding
Bucshon	F.	Honda
Burgess	Duckworth	Hoyer
Bustos	Duffy	Hudson
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Huffman
Capps	Edwards	Huizenga (MI)
Capuano	Ellison	Hultgren
Cárdenas	Ellmers (NC)	Hunter
Carney	Emmer (MN)	Hurd (TX)
Carson (IN)	Engel	Hurt (VA)
Carter (GA)	Eshoo	Israel
Carter (TX)	Esty	Issa
Cartwright	Farenthold	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Farr	Jeffries
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Jenkins (KS)
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Chu, Judy	Fleischmann	Johnson (GA)
Cicilline	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Clark (MA)	Flores	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry	Jolly
Clay	Foster	Jones
Cleaver	Fox	Jordan
Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	Joyce
Coffman	Franks (AZ)	Kaptur
Cohen	Frelinghuysen	Katko
Cole	Fudge	Keating
Collins (GA)	Gabbard	Kelly (IL)
Collins (NY)	Gallego	Kelly (MS)
Comstock	Garamendi	Kelly (PA)
Conaway	Garrett	Kennedy
Connolly	Gibbs	Kildee

Kilmer	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin
Kind	Nadler	Scott, David
King (IA)	Napolitano	Sensenbrenner
King (NY)	Neal	Serrano
Kinzinger (IL)	Neugebauer	Sessions
Kirkpatrick	Newhouse	Sewell (AL)
Kline	Nolan	Sherman
Knight	Norcross	Shimkus
Kuster	Nunes	Shuster
LaHood	O'Rourke	Simpson
LaMalfa	Olson	Sinema
Lamborn	Palazzo	Sires
Lance	Pallone	Slaughter
Langevin	Palmer	Smith (MO)
Larsen (WA)	Pascarella	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Latta	Payne	Stefanik
Lawrence	Pearce	Stewart
Lee	Pelosi	Stivers
Levin	Perlmuter	Stutzman
Lewis	Perry	Swalwell (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Peters	Takai
Lipinski	Peterson	Takano
LoBiondo	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Loeback	Pittenger	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
Long	Pocan	Thornberry
Loudermilk	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Lowenthal	Poliquin	Tipton
Lowe	Polis	Titus
Lucas	Pompeo	Torres
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Trott
Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)	Tsongas
(NM)	Price, Tom	Turner
Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Upton
(NM)	Ratcliffe	Valadao
Lummis	Reed	Van Hollen
Lynch	Renacci	Vargas
MacArthur	Ribble	Veasey
Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Vela
Carolyn	Rice (SC)	Velázquez
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Visclosky
Marchant	Rigell	Wagner
Marino	Roby	Walberg
Massie	Roe (TN)	Walden
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Walker
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
McCauley	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi
McClintock	Rokita	Walz
McCormack	Rooney (FL)	Wasserman
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
McGovern	Roskam	Waters, Maxine
McHenry	Ross	Watson Coleman
McKinley	Rothfus	Weber (TX)
McMorris	Rouzer	Webster (FL)
Rodgers	Roybal-Allard	Welch
McNerney	Royce	Wenstrup
McSally	Ruiz	Westerman
Meadows	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland
Meehan	Rush	Whitfield
Meeks	Russell	Williams
Meng	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Messer	Salmon	Wittman
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Womack
Miller (FL)	T.	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
Moolenaar	Sanford	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Sarbanes	Yoho
Moore	Schakowsky	Young (AK)
Moulton	Schiff	Young (IA)
Mullin	Schrader	Young (IN)
Mulvaney	Schweikert	Zeldin
Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)	

## NOT VOTING—24

Bass	Fincher	Scalise
Bishop (UT)	Grijalva	Smith (NE)
Black	Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)
Blumenauer	Labrador	Speier
Boyle, Brendan	Love	Tonko
F.	Noem	Wilson (FL)
Brown (FL)	Nugent	Zinke
Butterfield	Rangel	
Chaffetz	Reichert	

□ 1118

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 21; Tuesday, March 22; and

Wednesday, March 23, 2016, I was on medical leave while recovering from hip replacement surgery and unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 130 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4314, as amended).

"No" on rollcall vote No. 131 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 653).

"No" on rollcall vote No. 132 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 653).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 133 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4742).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 134 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4755).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 135 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4336, as amended).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 136 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 2745, with instructions).

"No" on rollcall vote No. 137 (on passage of H.R. 2745).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 138 (on agreeing to the resolution on H. Res. 658).

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, due to an illness I was unable to vote on the following:

Rollcall No. 130.

Rollcall No. 131.

Rollcall No. 132.

Rollcall No. 133.

Rollcall No. 134.

Rollcall No. 135.

Rollcall No. 137.

Rollcall No. 138.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 136, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2745, which would add protections for consumers by ensuring that the underlying bill would not apply to mergers that would unreasonably increase the costs of pharmaceutical drugs (rollcall No. 136), I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for the vote on the passage of H.R. 2745, the Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act (rollcall No. 137), I would have voted "nay." This bill would eliminate important administrative and procedural tools the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) uses to protect market competition and the American consumer. Additionally, this bill seems unnecessary, particularly after the Wall Street Journal dubbed 2015 the "biggest year ever for mergers and acquisitions."

Additionally, had I been present for the vote on H. Res. 658, a resolution condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Brussels on March 22, 2016, (rollcall No. 138), I would have voted "aye." These attacks signal a painful continuation in our struggle against terrorism.

## REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 125, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, from the Committee on the Budget, submitted a

privileged report (Rept. No. 114-470) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## CONGRATULATING STUDENTS ON ACCEPTANCE AS DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FUTURE PHYSICIANS AND MEDICAL SCIENTISTS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate several students from Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District on their appointments as delegates to the Congress of Future Medical Leaders. These students will be delegates to the Congress of Future Medical Leaders to be held later this year in Massachusetts.

The Congress is an honors-only program for high school students who want to become physicians or are going into a field devoted to medical research.

Each of these students was nominated by their teachers and has demonstrated tremendous academic success. Many who attend the Congress will receive full academic scholarships as they look toward completing university courses.

The six students selected to attend the Congress of Future Medical Leaders represent many communities in the Fifth Congressional District. Those chosen include: Courtney Craft from Bradford Area High School, Aubrey Feinour from Penns Valley High School, Kendra Gadley from West Forest Secondary School, Bella Huber from Central Mountain High School, Needhi Sharma from State College High School, and Laiken Turner from Mt. Union High School.

I wish these students the best of success at the Congress in June and as their academic careers progress and continue.

## POVERTY AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the sixth anniversary of the adoption of the Affordable Care Act.

I am proud of the role I played as majority leader in 2010 to bring that legislation to the floor, legislation that has been extraordinarily successful in making affordable coverage accessible to millions of Americans.

The Affordable Care Act has become a critical tool in fighting poverty. As a result of the Affordable Care Act, 20

million previously uninsured individuals now have coverage.

Expanded Medicaid is now covering 8.6 million Americans in 28 States and the District of Columbia. Were the rest of the States to implement it, it would provide access to affordable, quality care to another 5.1 million Americans.

Young people under age 26 can be covered under a parent's plan, making it easier for them to find their footing in the workforce. And insurance companies, Mr. Speaker, can no longer deny coverage based on a preexisting condition.

As we mark this anniversary, the Democratic Whip's Task Force on Poverty, Income Equality, and Opportunity will continue to lead efforts to defend the law against attempts to repeal or undermine it, and we will pursue additional policies that help more Americans stay healthy, put roofs over their heads, and find jobs that lift them out of poverty and into the middle class.

#### HONORING SHERIFF'S DEPUTY CARL KOONTZ

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Howard County Sheriff's Deputy Carl Koontz, who was killed in the line of duty last Sunday.

Deputy Koontz had strong ties to Howard County. He was a graduate of both Western High School in Russiaville and Indiana University Kokomo. As a member of the force, he served as a school resource officer, positively impacting the hundreds of students with whom he interacted on a daily basis.

Deputy Koontz was also a husband and a father to an 8-month-old son, Noah. Noah will be celebrating Easter this Sunday without his father and will never know him.

I offer my deepest and most heartfelt condolences for the family of Deputy Koontz during this time, and I thank him for all of his hard work and ultimate sacrifice.

I also pray for the continued recovery of Sergeant Jordan Buckley, who was also injured on Sunday.

#### HONORING CESAR CHAVEZ

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to remind us of a great American, Cesar Chavez. Born in Yuma, Arizona, he dedicated his life to making sure that he fought for workers in America and around the world.

He only had an eighth grade education, but he served our country honorably in the military as well and risked his life and served the people of America honorably.

One of the key tenets of his life was nonviolence. That is something that is

timely for us to remind ourselves of, as Americans, at this time when we choose who our leader is going to be, that we do it respectfully, honorably, and nonviolently.

So, with that, I would like to commemorate the opportunity to remind all of us to speak from our heart, to work from our heart, to be kind to our brothers, sisters, and our neighbors, and to do things and make change for the better nonviolently in honor of our fellow American, Cesar Chavez.

#### POLL: MEDIA HAS TOO MUCH POWER

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans know that liberal media bias is a major problem in our country.

A recent Rasmussen poll found that Americans believe media bias is a bigger problem in politics than large campaign contributions. It also found that a large majority of Americans, 66 percent, believe the news media has too much power and influence over government decisions.

A Media Research Center analysis of The New York Times provides an example. MRC found that, since last August, The New York Times has never characterized Hillary Clinton or BERNIE SANDERS as being hard-line or hard-left. In contrast, Republican candidates have been labeled as hard-line 45 times and hard-right 13 times. That is 58-0.

Americans will continue to view the media as a problem until it provides fair and balanced coverage. The media should give the American people the facts, not tell them what to think.

#### TOXIC CONTAMINATION IN SOUTHEAST LOS ANGELES

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to bring attention to an issue afflicting communities in southeast Los Angeles.

Today communities in Vernon and the surrounding areas are dealing with the aftermath of years of toxic contamination by a now-closed lead-acid battery recycling plant.

The recycling plant, which was owned by the company Exide Technologies, operated for years in the city of Vernon. Even though it had multiple violations documented by inspectors in the late 1990s of bad things going on, there were few punitive measures used against them.

Ultimately, who paid the price? The contaminated areas can be cleaned up, but those communities that live there, mostly composed of working class Mexican Americans, now have to deal with long-term health effects of being exposed, like cancer.

Time and time again, when our infrastructure fails us, when corporations violate the rules, it is the most vulnerable communities that pay for it. I want to remind my colleagues we have to be vigilant.

#### AMERICA GRIEVES WITH THE BELGIAN PEOPLE

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share in the grief of the Belgian people after yesterday's horrific acts of terror that claimed the lives of over 30 innocent people and injured more than 200, some of whom were Americans, and to lend my voice to a call for action.

We, the Representatives of the American people, condemn the latest barbarity by the scum called ISIS. It should be clear to all that these terrorists are at war with the West. But are we at war with them? The actions by this administration at least thus far say no.

These terrorist thugs will continue to rape, pillage, and murder until they are destroyed. The United States and our allies are long overdue in doing just that.

□ 1130

#### REJECT DISCRIMINATION AND UPHOLD OUR VALUES

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I stood with my colleagues on the House floor in a moment of silence as we mourned for the victims in Brussels.

Today, as I watched leading politicians propose discriminatory policies targeting the Muslim community, I cannot be silent. Seventy years ago, my parents and grandparents were held prisoner during World War II without trial and without a reason, other than their Japanese heritage. In that moment, no one was willing to speak up for them. We cannot ignore the lessons of history.

The Muslim community is the most frequent victim of terrorism and our greatest ally in ridding the world of extremism. Responding to Brussels by advocating for patrols of Muslim neighborhoods, or suggesting that we torture our enemies, is not only counterproductive, it violates the moral code that separates us from our enemies.

It is my duty, and it is every American's duty to reject discrimination and uphold our values.

#### 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRI- CITY REGIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce on their 10-year anniversary celebration. This auspicious occasion marks the date that the Richland and the Tri-City area Chamber of Commerce merged to form the regional Chamber in 2006.

The Tri-Cities is the fourth largest metropolitan area in the State of Washington, situated at the confluence of the Columbia, Snake and Yakima Rivers. The beautiful Columbia Basin and 300 days of sunshine attract opportunities for agriculture, recreation, and business.

The Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce represents nearly 1,200 diverse businesses, providing access to customers and a network for job creators. The Chamber provides visibility for partner companies and works to improve the economic climate of our region. The Chamber represents local leaders, working to advance the local economy and the quality of life in the Tri-Cities.

With the motto of "Bolder, Brighter, Better," this advocacy group has had a tremendously positive impact, attracting jobs to our community. It is my distinct pleasure to recognize and congratulate them on this milestone.

#### NUCLEAR SECURITY

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the only physicist remaining in the United States Congress, I feel a special responsibility to speak out on the importance of strengthening global nuclear security.

In just a few days, the United States will host the fourth and final Nuclear Security Summit. World leaders from more than 50 countries will convene in Washington, D.C., to participate in a global dialogue to reinforce our commitment at the highest levels to securing nuclear materials. To date, these summits have been instrumental in achieving critical nuclear security objectives, such as minimizing the use of highly enriched uranium in reactors around the world, and enhancing membership in international organizations like the IAEA. But more remains to be done.

It is no secret that rogue regimes and clandestine organizations continue to exhibit the ambition to acquire nuclear materials that can be used to create crude radiological dirty bombs or nuclear weapons.

I am, however, optimistic that with our allies and partners around the world, we will continue to develop new and innovative ideas to secure vulnerable nuclear material and make the world a safer place.

#### HONORING THE BRAVE MEN AND WOMEN IN BLUE

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, we owe so much to the brave men and women who police our Nation's streets. Every day they selflessly put on their uniforms to stand in harm's way to keep us safe.

In my district, on March 9, an off-duty Jacksonville detective, who was taking his son to school, was shot while making an unexpected stop after witnessing a suspect driving erratically. He has been upgraded to a stable condition now, but it is a sobering reminder of how quickly evil can strike.

On March 13, Maryland Police Officer Jacai Colson was the 23rd police officer killed in the line of duty this year. May he rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, these tragedies have gone from infrequent to occasional to nearly everyday occurrences across the country. To me and law-abiding American citizens, this is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't much room between order and chaos. Members of our police force are the first, and sometimes only, line of defense that we have from the evils that lurk in the shadows.

Our law enforcement officers deserve every ounce of support, respect, and gratitude that we can bestow upon them. Let us thank all of our first responders and our police officers. Let us pray for their safety, their families, and may God bless the brave men and women in blue.

#### ALLOW THE WOMEN AIRFORCE SERVICE PILOTS TO BE INURNED AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, this is Women's History Month, and it is only appropriate that we finally give a group of remarkable women who served this country an honor that they have been denied far too long—the opportunity to be buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

I am referring to the Women Airforce Service Pilots, more commonly known as the WASPs. These women were remarkable, flying 78 different types of aircraft for the United States Army Air Force during World War II. They were stationed throughout the United States. They flew the very same missions as their male counterparts, over 60 million miles of operational flights. Despite their patriotism and selfless service, they did not receive veteran status until 1977, and yet, today, they cannot be buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

Thankfully, the House has already acted. They passed legislation—I was proud to cosponsor it—that would allow these WASPs to be laid to rest at Arlington National Cemetery. I am hopeful that the Senate will soon fol-

low suit and send the bill to the President.

#### KEEP THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA A SAFE PLACE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to see that the House came together to have unanimous support for a resolution condemning the Brussels attacks, the terrorism, and the loss of life there as a result of terrorist activity.

We can't just stop there, though, with words from the House. We need to have action to ensure that our allies know that they are our allies. But also, our first primary goal is the safety of the United States citizens and the United States soil.

We need to vet whoever is going to be immigrating to this country, whoever the so-called immigrants are, and we need to be vetting the refugees here. It is our first obligation for the safety of the American people and the soil of the U.S. that we have the full information on who is coming here and who they are.

The methods we have now are endangering our country because we don't know who is coming here, and they certainly don't look like refugees in a lot of cases.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important first step to be in lockstep with the people of Belgium in their time of struggle and need. Let's also remember that we need to keep the United States of America a safe place.

#### BRUSSELS ATTACKS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I come with a heavy heart to acknowledge the deep tragedy that happened in Brussels, Belgium, yesterday.

Having participated in the Inter-Parliamentary Exchange, I traveled to Brussels on a number of occasions to join with the European Union. But more importantly, I had the sad duty of coming onto the then-Select Committee on Homeland Security and, ultimately, the Committee on Homeland Security in the very shadows of 9/11. I was in this Congress as it occurred, and I went to Ground Zero as they were still recovering individuals, as those firefighters and first responders would not stop.

Our hearts are heavy and we are desirous of being helpful. As Brussels recovers and responds, we need to stand with them. But as well, let me be very clear: let us not allow the terrorists to terrorize us; let us recognize the broadness of this Nation, the Muslims who put on the uniform of the United States military to fight on our behalf.

Let us act with consciousness, providing more security and more human resources to make a difference.

As I close, let me acknowledge the historic trip of President Obama to Cuba and say that engagement is very important.

#### REMEMBERING WE ARE ALL PART OF THE HUMAN FAMILY

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a very important day in my family's life. I have been the happiest man for 2 years, ever since I married my wife Monica and, also, the birth of Sky and Sage, my twin daughters. They are here with me today. We celebrated their first birthday yesterday with friends and family and good folks.

It has been one of those years of reflection that makes us all human—being a father, being a husband, and having a family. That is the essence that combines us all, as human beings.

I urge my colleagues to pause, celebrate their families, celebrate their children, their parents, hug them, love them, and let's remember we are all part of the human family.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND EARLY ACT ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, good luck—mazel tov—to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the sixth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act. This was President Obama's and congressional Democrats' landmark law, which has helped 20 million Americans—1.7 million Floridians in my home State—get quality, affordable health care.

It is a law that outlawed discrimination against people like me—a woman and a cancer survivor—who could have been prevented from obtaining care before the ACA ended that injustice.

It is also the anniversary of the EARLY Act, a law that I was proud to author, which passed as part of the ACA. The EARLY Act empowers young women with the information and resources they need to understand their breast health and the risks that they face.

As a cancer survivor and a mother, these two anniversaries are near and dear to my heart. I will continue working with my sister survivors, with the healthcare and cancer communities, along with Vice President BIDEN's inspirational National Cancer Moonshot, to expand care; protect more of our daughters, sisters, and mothers; and, finally, beat cancer once and for all.

#### BRUSSELS ATTACKS

(Mr. MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution passed earlier today condemning the heinous acts that occurred in Brussels yesterday.

Whenever such cowardly attacks take place against innocent people, we all are victims. Of course, the attacks in Brussels are not isolated and, sadly, remind me of the recent attacks of terror in Paris, in Nigeria, in Kenya, in Turkey, against people of all faiths. I shall not recite all of the cities that come to mind in what has become a new normal.

As a global community, we must continue to unite against this threat abroad and at home until we have brought the extremists who perpetuate such crimes to justice.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by reminding us all here in this Chamber, as well as our European friends, that during these difficult times, we should remember what brings us together. The resolution passed earlier is not just about Belgium-U.S. relations, nor is it about the recent attacks in Brussels. The resolution also reminds us that the nature of the response is what brings us together. The solutions to terror are to be found only with an emphasis on the Democratic and individual rights that we humbly work to protect.

□ 1145

#### REEVALUATING OUR ANTI-ISIS POLICY

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent attack in Brussels, it is appropriate to reevaluate our anti-ISIS policy. The Obama administration's basic policy is sound in three parts—don't be suckered into declaring war against 1.4 billion Muslims around the world; don't be suckered by a small group of misguided psychopaths. Second, bomb ISIS appropriately. Third, arm the right rebels in Syria—but, in the details, the policy needs to be strengthened.

We have armed dozens, rather than thousands, in Syria because we insist that those whom we arm swear that they will not attack Assad. Assad has killed 200,000 civilians. Patriotic Syrians will wage war against that regime. Second, in our bombing, we have a zero civilian casualties policy. We will not hit a tanker truck that carries ISIS oil if it is moving, which means there is a driver in that truck, and that driver might be a civilian. We provide free electricity to ISIS-controlled areas.

It is time to get serious about our efforts against ISIS.

#### FACT-CHECKING GOP CLAIMS ON THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation in a generation.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, 20 million people have gained health insurance coverage. As this chart shows, the percentage of the population without health insurance is now under 10 percent. That is the first time this has happened in our Nation's history. Just look at it. The uninsurance rate was steady for many, many years. Then, after the Affordable Care Act was passed, it dropped like a stone.

Thanks to the ACA, young people are now able to stay on their parents' plans. Thanks to the ACA, families who could not get health insurance through their employers can now get it. Thanks to the ACA, people who couldn't afford health insurance can get subsidies to help them afford it. Thanks to the ACA, people who have what the insurance industry calls pre-existing conditions are no longer left high and dry.

The ACA has been a lifesaver for people who were previously uninsured. It is a good thing for our economy and a promise kept to our constituents. I would like to wish the ACA, the Affordable Care Act, a very happy anniversary. Look at the chart.

#### PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota) laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

S. CON. RES. 34

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Wednesday, March 23, 2016, through Friday, April 8, 2016, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 3:30 p.m. on Monday, April 11, 2016, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.*

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, and Mr. Speaker, I will not ultimately object; but on Thursday or Friday last, I had an extended conversation with the majority

leader about adjourning. I pointed out to the majority leader at that point in time that there were a number of critical health issues pending that needed to be addressed by this House. Frankly, we should not be adjourning without doing so.

Zika is a threat to young women, to young men, and to our populations in Puerto Rico and in the Virgin Islands, and we should have responded to the President's supplemental request so that it could be effectively responded to.

In addition, we still have the ongoing Flint water crisis, caused by the negligence, frankly, of the Governor and the Department of Environmental Quality in Michigan. Thousands of young people have been put at risk.

We also, of course, have the opiate addiction crisis with which we ought to be dealing. It is an immediate threat to each and every one of our communities.

Lastly, I am pleased that the Speaker and the majority leader are working towards an early consideration, as soon as we get back, of legislation which will allow Puerto Rico to face the financial crisis that confronts it.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but it is lamentable that we have not dealt with these four critically important issues before we adjourn.

I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Without objection, the concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WHEN THE LAW DOES NOT FOLLOW THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

#### THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ISAAC LOWE

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for yielding to me so I may pay tribute to a great, stellar woman from northern California. This can't be done in a 1-minute speech, so a little extra time is very, very fitting in recognition of her work and her life.

In rising today, I join with many northstate residents in honoring the life and legacy of Isaac Lowe, an incredible woman and a prominent civil rights leader, who passed away just a few weeks ago in Redding, California.

She was born in 1921 in Wharton, Texas. Isaac was the second youngest of nine children, learning early the importance of hard work. She attended Tillotson Business College in Austin, Texas, and Prairie View A&M in Prairie View. It was during a visit to check

up on a sick friend in California when she met her future husband, Vernon Lowe, whom she married soon after and started her family in Redding, California.

Being an African American woman in the 1940s, unfortunately, racism was no stranger to Isaac. Despite holding a business degree, she was denied jobs because employers chose to judge her skin color rather than her impressive credentials. Isaac did not give up. She started a catering business in Redding, and she eventually became the first Black woman to be hired by the County of Shasta, working in social services for 17 years and helping others. However, Isaac's most noble work was through her plight to advance racial equality in her own neighborhood.

Upon first moving to Redding, all but one of the Black families lived on the same street and were segregated from the community. This was a status quo that she didn't accept. Isaac joined her husband in founding the Redding chapter of the NAACP and began her 65-year journey of advocating for civil rights and worked very hard in order to hold onto that charter of the NAACP when times got a little leaner back in the seventies. She lobbied city and county lawmakers for safe and affordable housing for Black families. She worked with local school officials for the equal treatment of Black children in the community's mainly White schools. She fought for fairness and justice under the law for all citizens in the judicial system. She raised funds and successfully sought approval from city hall for the construction of the only Martin Luther King, Jr., community center between Sacramento and Oregon at that time.

It was her compassionate advocacy and her resiliency that helped change Shasta County for the better. Some of her most notable accomplishments included being the first Black woman to serve on Shasta County's grand jury, where she served as a founding member of the Shasta County Citizens Against Racism and was awarded the Redding Citizen of the Year in 1992. Her proudest moment was in getting the Redding City Council members to recognize Martin Luther King Day as a holiday.

Her legacy speaks volumes of the person she was and of the impact she had on so many lives. One of the anecdotes I know about her informally is that she was fairly commonly referred to as the "Rosa Parks of Redding, California." She was a deeply caring friend, a loving wife and mother, and a selfless advocate.

I had the chance to meet Isaac personally on different occasions—some positive and one, actually, a very negative occasion, but it was made positive by how the community responded to a very ugly racial incident that took place against a Black family in their home. Many of us in the community joined together in a march in solidarity, protesting, that we were not going to tolerate this in our commu-

nity in northern California. Isaac was there, being strong but also being that smiling, positive voice. You could see her strength. You could also see the light shining from within her as she advocated for what was right for everybody, really, at the end of the day.

If we had more people like her and if we had more harmony instead of the divisiveness that we see so badly affecting this country today, we would be much better off. Northern California has lost a gem, but her legacy will live on, and we all recognize that. I am honored to be able to note that here today on the U.S. House floor and to properly show that. Her legacy even lives on in the papers she published and that are right over here in the Library of Congress, which note some of her work in the past for the NAACP. Indeed, it is a rich legacy that reaches all the way to Washington, D.C.

I appreciate my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for allowing me to make this special tribute to Isaac Lowe today.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from California (Mr. LAMALFA). I did not realize I should have been joining in that tribute with the gentleman. Her being born in Wharton, Texas, and going to college in Texas, we share her as a real gem that the Lord provided to both of us. I thank the gentleman for sharing that with us.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being allowed to attend oral arguments at the Supreme Court, and I appreciate their staff and their accommodation. Not everybody over there recognizes that there are three independent, coequal branches of government the way the Founders intended, but I am extremely grateful for those who do, and we afford the mutual respect between us. That is a good thing.

So, to the clerk of the Court and to Perry and others, I thank you for your accommodation.

I am a member of the Supreme Court Bar, which allows attorneys, as far as seating, to come sit in front of the bar, on the side of the bar with the litigants, and to get a real ringside seat—actually, inside the ring.

The case today was, actually, a consolidation of a number of cases. Probably most well-known—probably that should be most well-known—was the Little Sisters of the Poor. We had representatives from East Texas Baptist University in my district in Marshall, Texas. It is just a super school. They are a religious school, and they are not ashamed, because they are East Texas Baptist University, to teach what religious convictions inform them are the right things to do. They follow the law. The problem is when the law does not follow the Constitution, and that is what has gotten us into the problem that was faced today and is being faced at the Supreme Court.

It is amazing. I was telling a group here just recently that, in east Texas, we call it "common sense," but when I get to Washington, we usually just



have to call it “sense” because it is not common at all. I found that to be the case at the Supreme Court during oral arguments. I do have great sympathy for all of the eight remaining Justices in this regard.

□ 1200

Once the Supreme Court issues a ruling that clearly violates the Constitution, for all who truly have eyes and truly have ears to hear not clouded by secular humanism, but informed by the Constitution's words itself, then they see that, when a court rules against the Constitution, violating the Constitution by its very ruling, it creates a terribly difficult situation for itself.

Because once the bold, visible lines that are spelled out in the Constitution are violated and erased, the Court is charged with an ongoing impossible task of trying to find a place to redraw those lines.

Now, it is unfortunate that some of the Justices—in fact, four of them—kept trying to draw a line in a manner that was not before the Court. They showed themselves to be not necessarily very able jurists who loved justice, but, in fact, very experienced politicians.

Because politicians know, if you are wrong on an issue and somebody brings up the issue about which you are wrong, the thing to do is change the subject and make it about something that you are not wrong about.

You point to something that is a very difficult question and say that that is a very difficult question and, as good magicians do, divert the attention away from the wrong that you have already done and that you are about to complicate.

Mr. Speaker, the wrong about which I speak was the violation by Congress coupled with the violation by the Supreme Court itself.

For the first time in our Nation's history, having the United States Federal Government with all its powers, its guns, its ability to take people's homes—well, that is the IRS. Most folks can't take homes.

But to just wreak havoc on the well-being of a family, of a business, the Federal Government says for the first time: You have to purchase a product. It is required.

There is nothing in the Constitution that either allows or encourages the United States Government to order all American citizens to buy a product.

As we went through discussion on ObamaCare back during 2009 until it passed in 2010, at first, the President and his minions were saying that, well, clearly this is not a tax. It was a mandate.

It says: You must buy a product and, if you don't comply with our Federal order to buy this product, this health insurance—and it has to be what we say health insurance is, not some idea you have—we will dictate what the health insurance is, and you have to provide it. If you don't, it is not a tax.

There is a penalty for violating the law, the mandatory obligation that we have imposed on every American. Well, nothing allows that and many things prohibit it.

Over the years, Members of Congress and even the Supreme Court and Presidents have used the Commerce Clause, that we have the right to control interstate commerce, as the basis for which to get involved in matters of commerce that lie within a State.

In this case, Chief Justice Roberts in this part of the opinion very correctly states that, if you allow the Federal Government to say we have jurisdiction to mandate people buy health insurance and not just any health insurance. It has to have the things in it that we dictate, then there is no place you could ever draw a line and say the Commerce Clause does not allow for this and ultimately decided that, under the Commerce Clause, ObamaCare was unconstitutional.

Simply citing the fact that everybody, at some point, seeks health care—and most people have some form of health insurance at some point—that does not give the Federal Government the right to come in and take over and even dictate the purchase of a product.

We had some in this room and at the other end of this building in the Senate who furthered the argument that this is old news, that the Government has been able to do this for many years. It is called car insurance or automobile insurance. Governments have been requiring insurance and penalizing if you didn't buy insurance for years. This is not a new concept.

The trouble is that was not an appropriate comparison at all. For one thing, that is activity within the State. It was not the Federal Government that required an insurance policy. And there was no mandate that everyone within a State had to have that car insurance.

Courts have long held that driving on a highway built by the State or Federal Government or county is a privilege. You do not have a constitutional right to drive a car on a government road. But if you choose to drive a car, a vehicle, on a government road, in that case, then you must have insurance.

The difference is driving on a road is a privilege. In the case of ObamaCare, the Federal Government said just breathing, walking around living or even lying prostrate in your bed, even if you are confined to your bed—it doesn't matter—just being a living person we will say under our Constitution is a privilege that the government giveth and the government taketh away.

Therefore, we are saying that, if you are going to exist, breathe, live, you must have health insurance, and not just any health insurance. It has to have the provisions we say and those will not necessarily include the things you need in your life.

We, as the omniscient, ubiquitous government—of course, it may be more ubiquitous than we know—we have a right to tell you what is good for you and what isn't. Once the government can tell you what you have to have or have not in the way of health care, they have the right to control your life.

So it was interesting, for one thing, that, in this case, the government had conceded that these were sincerely, deeply held religious beliefs of all the plaintiffs. So that was not an issue.

It was not an issue like some people who were trying to dodge the draft, except for religious purposes when sometimes it was and sometimes it was not. It was conceded in this case all of the deeply held religious beliefs were very sincere by the litigants.

I heard something I don't know that I have heard before in a Supreme Court argument when Justice Sotomayor made a statement of fact about the case.

One of the litigants who may not have been politically astute, but, apparently, accurate, said that, factually, Justice Sotomayor, that is just not the case. That is just not true here.

Where four of the Justices showed incredible aptitude for being politicians and not Justices, they diverted attention—as I said, good magicians do this. Good politicians do this.

They diverted attention away from the real problem and diverted away from the actual question before the Court and kept digging and pointing to a question that was not before the Court.

That point was that the four Justices kept wanting to talk about objections to objecting on the basis of religious beliefs.

They kept wanting to talk about the difficulty in drawing lines, that: “Gee, what do we do if the plaintiffs or the defendants”—the litigants in the particular case—subjects would probably be more accurate under ObamaCare—the subjects of the United States—it used to be U.S. citizens—“are not objecting to objecting on the basis of religious beliefs?”

That has come up in cases before where someone would say: “I believe my religious belief is so personal. You should not make me object on the basis of religious beliefs because then I would have to reveal what my religious beliefs are and that is none of your business. So we object to objecting.”

So the four most liberal Justices kept wanting to talk about: “But where do we draw the line in this issue if there is an objection to objecting on the basis of religious grounds?”

The able attorneys for the American subjects to the fast-growing monarchy here in the United States kept trying to bring them back to what was before the Court: “Justices, none of these clients, none of the litigants, object to objecting on religious grounds. They have no problem with objecting on religious grounds. They have objected on

religious grounds. They filed objections both administratively and in court when they filed for injunction. They have had no problem objecting to objecting on the basis of religious beliefs. So that is not really an issue."

Once again, when Justices are in the wrong, they don't want to talk about the issue before the Court. They want to talk about the issue that is not before the Court. Let's talk about how many angels you might could get on the head of a needle. Let's talk about anything but the elephant in the room.

The real elephant in the room and the reason for which I have sympathy for all eight Justices is that, once they violated the Constitution by saying *ObamaCare* was constitutional, they created so many scenarios that are going to be nightmares for the Court to try to figure out where we stop the flood as it overwhelms the rights of Americans.

It is just a massive—like that 1950s movie or maybe it was early '60s—"The Blob." You just couldn't stop it. It would go out one place and come out another.

And that is the problem when the Supreme Court violates the Constitution in the case of *ObamaCare*, saying: You can dictate to American citizens. You can make them American subjects to this all-powerful, dictatorial Federal Government. You can tell them what to buy. You can punish them for not buying it.

And, of course, we know that—although Chief Justice Roberts was exactly right and on point when he said: Gee, if you try to use the Commerce Clause, jurisdiction over interstate commerce, to justify the takeover of health care and a mandate to buy something the Federal Government says you have to buy, then there is no limit ever that can be drawn on the Commerce Clause.

□ 1215

So it is not constitutional under the Commerce Clause. It certainly appeared accurate when Chief Justice Roberts went through an explanation of the initial issue that they had to take up on *ObamaCare*, and that was the anti-injunction statute, which basically requires that, before a litigant in Federal court can have standing to be before the court and if it involves a tax, then the litigant must be someone against whom the tax has already been levied and the tax has already been paid. Only if the tax has been levied against the litigant and the tax has been paid do the courts recognize standing by that litigant to be before the court to make argument over any complaint.

So they had to deal with that issue because not only does a litigant not have standing to even stay in court if they are arguing about a tax and the tax has not been levied and the tax has not been paid, but the Federal court itself has no jurisdiction to even hear the controversy until the tax is levied and the tax is paid.

So Chief Justice Roberts had the difficult problem of investigating and ruling on whether or not the mandate and the penalty that comes if you don't purchase what is required by the Federal Government—is that a penalty or is that a tax?

Because if it is a tax, the law is very clear. We will have to rule that the plaintiffs do not have standing and their case be thrown out. And, similarly, we will rule that the Court does not have jurisdiction. The case, as it is said in court, is not ripe for litigation. So it will have to be thrown out.

If the court found that the penalty imposed by the Federal Government for not being a loyal American subject and buying a product that the monarchy or the growing dictatorship here says you have to buy—if it is a penalty, then you can come to court. We do have jurisdiction, and you do have standing.

So Chief Justice Roberts went through and ably explained how Congress called it a penalty. At that time, of course, the Democrats were in the majority here in the House as well as the Senate. The Democratic leadership, the Democratic supporters in favor of *ObamaCare*, had made it clear this is a penalty.

Chief Justice Roberts cited that, that Congress should know better than anyone else whether this is a penalty or it is a tax. Because if it is a penalty, again, the litigant can be here and have standing. We have got jurisdiction. But if it is a tax, we have to throw it out. We can't hear the case, not now.

He said Congress should know better than anyone. They decided it was a penalty. Not only that, but it really does appear to be a penalty because *ObamaCare* says: You have to buy insurance and you have to buy a product we say is okay. You can't buy what you want. You have to buy what we say you must buy. And if you don't do that, we will impose a financial penalty on you.

I am hearing more and more young people who are really perplexed: Yes. The government is giving me a subsidy to help me pay for my insurance, but my insurance has 5-, 6-, 7-, \$8,000 of a threshold that I have to meet before it ever helps me with a dime of insurance help. So am I better off getting the government subsidy, paying all this money that is really making my life miserable, or should I go ahead and pay the new income tax that I have added on to me for not having insurance as is dictated?

I think Chief Justice Roberts came to a proper conclusion. This truly is a penalty. It is not a tax because it is only paid if you violate the mandate that the Federal Government dictated. So, clearly, it is a penalty.

So there at page 1415 of the opinion, Chief Justice Roberts concludes: Okay. Congress says it is a penalty. It obviously is a penalty. If you don't want to pay the penalty, then buy the insurance. You won't have the penalty. It is

clearly a penalty. Since it is a penalty, the Anti-Injunction Act does not apply. Therefore, the plaintiffs do have standing, and not only do they have standing, but this court has jurisdiction. Now, because it is a penalty and not a tax, we have jurisdiction. So now we will proceed to consider the primary cause before us, whether or not the Federal Government can mandate for the first time in history that all of the American people buy a product that it dictates.

Then he went through and determined, if you say the Commerce Clause justifies Federal jurisdiction here, then the Commerce Clause has no limits, has no meaning. And we choose to find that the Commerce Clause has meaning. Therefore, this is unconstitutional under the Commerce Clause.

But, then again, about 40 pages after he says it is not a tax, it is a penalty, Chief Justice Roberts plays the mental gymnastics of arriving at saying: You know what. It turns out this really is not a penalty. It is a tax. And since it is a tax, a majority of us will find that it is constitutional. And so the Federal Government can impose a mandate requiring that all American citizens be loyal subjects, subject to the dictatorship here in Washington, buy whatever product we tell them to buy. And all of that is because the Supreme Court rewrote the law and called it a tax.

That is why the Supreme Court is struggling the way it is today. Because when you create an abomination, you violate the Constitution to the extent, you violate your conscience the way it was before it got so clouded with politics. You violate the Constitution and then you create the kind of mess that is before the Supreme Court today.

It is incredible to sit and listen to the Supreme Court struggling over this issue of just how far we can go to violate someone's religious beliefs. I didn't hear any one of the Justices refer to the First Amendment, that the government will establish no religion and not violate—or not prohibit the free exercise thereof.

My friend, KEITH ROTHFUS, a fellow Member of Congress, was sitting beside me. He got sworn in as a member of the Supreme Court bar today. KEITH ROTHFUS was pointing out that, in one of the prior Supreme Court decisions back in the 1960s, they actually had a footnote where they listed a lot of the religions that they found currently in the United States. It was a fairly full list.

But one of the religions in the United States recognized by the Supreme Court in the early 1960s was secular humanism. As KEITH ROTHFUS and I agreed, we have now come to the point where we are violating the First Amendment of the Constitution.

And not only are we violating the restraint against the Federal Government prohibiting the free exercise of religion, as it is doing for East Texas Baptist University, Houston Baptist University, Little Sisters of the Poor,

so many organizations that are religious in nature, but they have violated the part that said we will have no establishment of religion.

The Founders were thinking specifically about the Church of England and how the King didn't like the way the Vatican was ruling. And so he just created his own church, the Church of England. He said: Everybody has got to participate in my church now.

They didn't want that to ever happen where the government of the land could dictate the religion that people had to practice. Yet, that is what the Supreme Court has now done because it has now recognized secular humanism—not just recognized, but established secular humanism—as the State-sponsored religion in America.

With the ruling last summer, the Supreme Court, in effect, said: Since the 1960s, we have been limiting people's ability to use the word God, to pray to God, to read God's word, the Bible. We have been prohibiting that for 40 or so years, 50 years maybe, and we have been protecting what Moses said was the Word of God and what Jesus said was the Word of God for far too long.

They basically established secular humanism as the official religion of the United States. By their pronouncement, they were saying to forget what Moses said God said, forget what Jesus said.

When Jesus actually was asked about marriage and divorce, he quoted Moses verbatim: A man shall leave his father and mother, a woman leave her home. The two will become one flesh.

Then Jesus added, not just quoting Moses as to what Moses said God said about marriage: And what God has joined together, let nobody take apart.

The Supreme Court last summer said: The effect of the ruling is not only can you not talk about God publicly or pray or read the Bible, thank God we have speech and debate clause privileges here on this floor where I am actually free to even mention the word God. We pray every day to start our official day here in session. But the Supreme Court ruled, in effect: We are your God. The five of us in the majority of the Supreme Court are now your God. Forget what we said in our prior decisions about marriage. It was not mentioned in the Constitution. Therefore, under the 10th Amendment, it is reserved to the States and the people.

Forget the fact that we have talked before about the States will decide what marriage is. Forget our ruling on DOMA, the Defense of Marriage Act, passed by Congress, where we made very clear that the States only have the right to decide what marriage is.

Forget all that. Now we five majority Justices are your God. And forget the fact that we—at least two of us have violated the Federal law in order to reach this decision. Because the Federal law is very clear. If a judge—a Federal judge, magistrate, Justice might have their impartiality—his or her impartiality questioned, then they

should disqualify—they shall disqualify themselves from sitting on the case.

So we had two Justices. Not only was their opinion and their impartiality in question, there was actually no question that they were not impartial because they had both participated in same-sex wedding ceremonies. And Justice Ginsburg, who is a very nice lady, actually said—as Maureen Dowd pointed out in her article, she emphasized as she pronounced them married by virtue of the laws of the—and she said she really hammered the words—by the Constitution of the United States.

□ 1230

So, clearly, we had Justice Kagan and Justice Ginsburg perform same-sex marriages before they were not impartial. The law required them to disqualify themselves.

I have had some people say: Well, wouldn't it have disqualified any of the other judges if they had ever participated in a marriage between a man and a woman?

The answer is very easily and clearly no, because that was the law.

The question is: Can a government prohibit same-sex marriage?

It was same-sex marriage that was before the court, not can a government prohibit marriage between a man and a woman.

If the question had been: Can a government prohibit marriage between a man and a woman, then that might be a different story. But that was not the issue before the court. Two Justices were disqualified. They had made their opinion clearly known in advance.

There were other judges who had been asked, as I understand it, to do weddings, but they said: No, that might create a question of my impartiality and would require me to disqualify myself.

Well, their participation did certainly disqualify them. They refused to disqualify themselves. So two Justices, as a minimum, were disqualified as they participated in the majority of five.

So when you have an unconstitutional ruling by the United States Supreme Court, when the Chief Justice has to commit to the mental gymnastics, the loop-the-loops that he has to try to do to get around saying the mandate to purchase a policy that carries a penalty, is a penalty, and then over here we know he said it is a penalty over there, but now we are saying it is a tax, not a penalty, they created a nightmare for any legitimate judge with a conscience in trying to decide: Now that we have blown apart any constitutional lines, where do we draw the lines now?

It is rather tragic. Justice Kennedy was questioning one of the religious litigant's attorneys and made the statement, basically, that the court would find it very hard to write an opinion saying that if we give an exemption to a church, we then have to give it to all other religious institutions.

Well, that statement deeply troubled me as well because it means that Justice Kennedy does not understand the constitutional prohibition in the First Amendment. You are not on the Supreme Court or in Congress or in the Presidency to ever establish a religion. And it has been established. It is called secular humanism, which the Supreme Court has recognized as a religion. That is what is being established now.

You are also not to prohibit the free exercise of religion. When the Supreme Court gets to the point, as Justice Kennedy is, that we on this court—at least a majority—will find it very hard to say that if you are not a part of a church and acting as that church, then you have no right to practice any of your religious beliefs that five of us don't like, that is tragic.

I keep coming back to that prophetic statement by Benjamin Franklin when he was asked after the Constitutional Convention by a dear lady: What did you give us?

"A republic, madam, if you can keep it."

Why would he say "if you can keep it?"

The reason he said that is—as he knew—the nature of government is to take more and more power and authority over individual rights and individual liberties. And in order to keep a republic, as Ben Franklin called it, you have to teach generation after generation that there are responsibilities that come with citizenship. Because if you don't live up to those responsibilities, you will lose the republic, madam. You can't keep it.

We have done a miserable job of teaching the next generation about how you would keep a republic. Instead of being taught, as I was, in school the dangers of socialism, the dangers of communism, and that it always has to result in a dictatorship or a totalitarian government, that it requires people's rights be taken away, our Founders say that we have to recognize these rights are a gift from our Creator, from God, because if we say they are a gift of the government, then what the government giveth, the government can taketh away.

We have legislators and judges who have not been properly educated on the manner in which you keep a republic, madam.

It really has been heartbreaking when very smart young people ask sincerely: I understand socialism is supposed to be wrong, communism is supposed to be wrong, but it really sounds nice. Can you explain why it would be wrong? Because I don't get it. It sounds nice.

As the New Testament Church started out, as the Pilgrims' Compact started out, you bring into the common storehouse, and then you share and share alike. You share from those according to their ability to those according to their need.

Of course, more than one parent has explained socialism to their children

by saying: Look, you got an A. I know how hard you were working every night doing your homework, but your friend over here got a C. I saw her out partying a lot of times when you were here studying. And she is not maybe quite as smart as you are, so she got a C, you got an A.

The socialist notion is that we have to give everybody a B. So we will make this A a B, we will make this C a B, and everybody will feel better for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have shared this before, but it was such a lesson to me as an exchange student to the Soviet Union being out at a collective farm. The farmers were sitting in the shade in midmorning, when anybody back home in east Texas knows that—especially in July, like it was—you start early and you try to finish early before the sun gets too hot. It is midmorning. This is prime time to be working before it gets too hot. And here are all the farmers sitting in the shade in the middle of their village.

Trying to use the best Russian I could—I had 2 years, which meant I could converse ably with a 4-year-old—I asked: When do you work out in the field?

I couldn't tell what they cultivated and didn't. It all looked brown. None of it looked very good. I would have expected in Texas that those fields would have been green, looking good, and the weeds out. You couldn't tell what was weeds and what wasn't.

I said: When do you work out in the field?

They laughed, and I thought I must not have translated that right. Then one of them said in Russian, basically: I make the same number of rubles if I am out there in the field in the sun or if I am here in the shade. So I am here in the shade.

I have carried that with me all these years. That is why socialism can't work. It is why socialism or communism—again, bringing all into the common storehouse, share and sharing alike—can never work on this Earth, in this world. Because the only way you will ever have share and share alike, as they found out in the New Testament Church, the only way you can make it work is if you have a totalitarian government that says: you will do what we say. And then there goes your freedoms.

So the only way to have the maximum amount of freedom is to have a self-governing republic so people can govern themselves by electing people that they have interviewed, they have read all about, done plenty of research on, and then they come forward on hiring day—otherwise known as election day—and they vote to hire the person that they want for their public servant. That is the way it is supposed to work.

People have not obliged themselves of the need that in order to keep a republic, you have to do the research on the candidates that have applied for your job. You have a requirement, a need, for you to actually come out and

vote. Look, I get it. There are so many I have heard from that are disenfranchised voters. They say: We hear about all these people.

John Fund has a great book out on the fraud that has been in so many of our modern elections that is not being dealt with, despite what the government says. It is a great book.

People find out there is fraud. Since they didn't have to have a photo ID like you have to have to buy cigarettes or alcohol or get on a plane or anything else, you can manipulate the system, you can vote more than one time.

My friend from south Texas told me about some of the people who were illegally in the country being approached with voter registration forms, saying: Fill these out. If you don't want to use your own address here, just use one central address. You can all use the same address.

Some of them were worried about showing an ID. They will figure out we are illegally in this country and we are not supposed to vote. They were assured: No, no.

President Obama's lawyer—Eric Holder at that time—has gotten a judge to rule that they can't require an ID and, therefore, all you have to do is fill this out. But if you don't fill this out, then Republicans are going to take away your welfare, they are going to take away your health care, and they are going to try to make you leave the country.

So you have got to fill this out. And even though it is illegal, there is nothing wrong with doing it. You will get the voter registration card in the mail to the address you give them, and then you just go vote and that is all you have to show them.

Thankfully, we have voter ID now in Texas. But there are so many people who have been disenfranchised, because they say: There is so much voter fraud going on. Why should I even bother? My vote doesn't count like somebody that votes more than once.

We are in grave danger of losing this republic. We are not going to keep it much longer the way we are going. We haven't educated future generations to how you go about keeping a self-governing republic. Some have been miseducated to think socialism, which has failed every single time it has ever been tried—it will always fail. We haven't educated them about the truth of freedom and what is required to keep it.

Justice Scalia told a group from my hometown that was here that the reason we are the most free Nation in history is not because we had the best Bill of Rights, but because the Founders didn't trust government. They wanted gridlock. They wanted it as difficult as possible to pass laws, because with the passage of every law is the risk that some freedom will be taken away by the Big Government.

□ 1245

The Founders knew that, and they made it hard to pass laws. That is not a bad thing. It is a good thing.

But when he mentioned that the Soviet Union had a better bill of rights than we had, I remembered, I did a paper back in college when I was at Texas A&M. After I had visited the Soviet Union as an exchange student, I wrote a paper on their system. But I had done a paper on their bill of rights, their Constitution. I was shocked at the extent of the rights that were guaranteed to the Soviet Union citizens.

I was also surprised to find that, in the early sixties, the Premier, Khrushchev, in the Soviet Union, had set up a commission, because those that had truly been educated on the different forms of government and governing know that, actually, true communism is only when there is no government, that it is like reaching for nirvana. You eventually reach the point where everybody is so sharing and so giving—taking from their ability, giving to the need—they are so giving that you don't even need a government anymore.

So Khrushchev set up a commission basically charged with coming up with a plan to reach that ultimate goal where someday there will be no government and we will have true communism in its purest form, no government, everyone giving, sharing, lovingly.

And I read that, after a couple of years of that commission trying to figure out, "How are we ever going to come up with a plan that eventuates in having no government and everybody always sharing equally? How are we going to ever pull that off?" they couldn't come up with a way to reach that in this world, in this life, and so Khrushchev disbanded the commission. There was no way to get there.

They were right. If you are going to have communism or socialism, you are going to have to have a totalitarian government, whether it is an individual dictator or a political group like they have or used to have at the Kremlin. You have got to have ruling autocrats, an oligarch, monarch, in order to force everybody to take from those who have worked hard, according to their ability, and giving to those who either can't work or choose not to work. The only way you can maximize freedoms is when people in the country understand what Franklin understood: you have got a republic if you can keep it.

We are not being vigilant to keep our Republic, and that is why so many are desperate now as they vote for a Presidential candidate.

And even Christian friends have said, you know, I understand there is a time and place for a David with a slingshot, complete faith in God, and a clear great ability with a slingshot. I know there is a time for that. But right now, our freedoms have been so badly eroded, we are losing the government. We are having people come in and start voting without understanding how you preserve a republic. We are losing the country. We are losing the melting pot that we once were, welcoming people

from all over and coming together and being molded into one thing, not a hyphenated American, but an American. We are losing that.

You see many voters standing in lines now. They didn't used to ever do this, stand in line for hours. You found people do that in Africa when they are finally afforded an opportunity to vote for the first time in their lives. But now, in America, some people are waiting hours to vote because they see that we have not been vigilant in protecting our Republic, and just as Franklin worried, we are about to lose it.

We are already losing it when the government can dictate that individuals buy a product, when the government can say you can only practice your religious beliefs if you are within the confines of a church, but if you are an individual, like the Founders were, who held tightly to their religious beliefs—they talked about it as they passed legislation; they talked about it as they created our Constitution—the Supreme Court is now saying: Secular humanism is what we must have; it is what we demand. And since we are in charge and we are moving toward being socialistic, you have got to have an oligarchy, and we are it.

Obviously, they don't say it in those words, but that is what their actions say, and that is why, when a Justice says: Well, this Court would find it very hard to write an opinion saying that we were moving the line from beyond a church and extending that line out to other religious institutions—like the Little Sisters of the Poor, these wonderful, superb Christian women who have given their lives doing what Jesus said, ministering to others, feeding His sheep, ministering to their physical needs, their healthcare needs—and the Supreme Court says: We have a lot of trouble. See, they are not actually a church. They are a religious institution, and we are going to have a hard time writing an opinion that moves the line to protect religious opinions.

My word, shouldn't have any trouble drawing a line at individuals. Any individual in the United States of America who has a deeply held, sincerely held religious belief, it was meant to be protected, unless it is completely anathema to our Constitution.

Sharia law is anathema; and to the extent that some believe they should replace our Constitution with their sharia law, then that is treason if they are here in this country. But otherwise, their religious belief should be recognized, and God help us if the Court doesn't do it right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, 114th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes

p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, April 11, 2016, at 3:30 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4714. A letter from the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's correcting amendments — Direct Farm Ownership Microloan; Correction (RIN: 0560-A133) received March 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4715. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Mark E. Ferguson III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4716. A letter from the Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Calendar Year 2015 reports to describe activities under the Secretary of Defense personnel management demonstration project authorities for the Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2358 note; Public Law 110-181, Sec. 1107(d); (122 Stat. 358); and Public Law 113-66, Sec. 1107(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4717. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's 2016 annual report to Congress on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m(a); Public Law 90-321, Sec. 815(a) (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1089(1)); (124 Stat. 2092); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4718. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Harford County, MD, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8425] received March 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4719. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Lancaster County, PA, et al.) [Docket No.: FEMA-2016-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8423] received March 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4720. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Streamlining Administrative Regulations for Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher, Multifamily Housing, and Community Planning and Development Programs [Docket No.: FR 5743-F-03] (RIN: 2577-AC92) received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4721. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Fiscal year 2015 Ryan White HIV/

AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Awards Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300ff-13(e); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title XXVI, Sec. 2603 (as amended by Public Law 109-415, Sec. 104(e)); (120 Stat. 2776) and 42 U.S.C. 300ff-29a(d); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title XXVI, Sec. 2620 (as amended by Public Law 109-415, Sec. 205(2)); (120 Stat. 2798); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4722. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Toys: Determination Regarding Heavy Elements Limits for Unfinished and Untreated Wood [Docket No.: CPSC-2011-0081] received March 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4723. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Amendment to Clarify When Component Part Testing Can Be Used and Which Textile Products Have Been Determined Not To Exceed the Allowable Lead Content Limits [Docket No.: CPSC-2011-0081] received March 22, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4724. A letter from the Acting Division Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of Section 224 of the Act [WC Docket No.: 07-245]; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future [GN Docket No.: 09-51] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4725. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1512 (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4726. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(d) Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1; (86 Stat. 619); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4727. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Atrocities Prevention Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 114-113, Sec. 7033; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4728. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4729. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4730. A letter from the Co-Chief Privacy Officers, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's Fiscal Year 2015

Privacy Act Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-2(a)(6); Public Law 108-447, Sec. 522(a)(6); (118 Stat. 3268); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4731. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Nixon Administration Presidential Historical Materials [FDMS No.: NARA-16-0004; NARA-2016-019] (RIN: 3095-AB86) received March 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4732. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "The District's Management Contract with The Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness was not Properly Managed in Fiscal Year 2014 to Ensure Performance Consistent with Contract Terms"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4733. A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4734. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's 2017-2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1344(c)(2); Aug. 7, 1953, ch. 345, Sec. 18(c) (as amended by Public Law 95-372, Sec. 208); (92 Stat. 649); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4735. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, Amtrak, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting an addition to the Grant and Legislative Request for FY17, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(a)(2); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 1(e); (108 Stat. 918); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4736. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31062; Amdt. No.: 3683] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4737. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Northeast United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3361; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4738. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; International Falls, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3084; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-13] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4739. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Enid Vance AFB, OK; Enid Woodring Municipal Airport, Enid, OK; and

Enid, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7489; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-20] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4740. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Clinton, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3967; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-12] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4741. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Controlling Agency for Selected Restricted Areas; North Carolina [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0151; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4742. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1345; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AWP-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4743. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for Lynchburg, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-6231; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-12] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4744. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Minot, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7485; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-25] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4745. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Rapid City, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7492; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-27] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4746. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Minnesota towns: Rochester, MN; and St. Cloud, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7484; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-24] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4747. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following New York Towns; Ithaca, NY; Poughkeepsie, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4532; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-

10] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4748. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wilmington, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7486; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-26] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4749. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0249; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-18393; AD 2016-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4750. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Michigan towns: Alpena, MI; and Muskegon, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7483; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-23] received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4751. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-3699; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-18402; AD 2016-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4752. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2456; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-18401; AD 2016-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4753. A letter from the Associate Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's report on identifying the 9-1-1 capabilities of the multi-line telephone system in use by all Federal Agencies in all Federal buildings and properties, pursuant to 212-96, Sec. 6504(a); (126 Stat. 242); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4754. A letter from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Trust's Annual Management Report for Fiscal Year 2015, pursuant to Public Law 107-90, Sec. 105; (115 Stat. 886); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4755. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on action taken to extend and amend the Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Italy Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Categories of Archaeological Material Representing the Pre-Classical, Classical and



Imperial Roman Periods of Italy, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2602(g)(1); Public Law 97-446, Sec. 303(g)(1); (96 Stat. 2354); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4756. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on Tribal Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program Report to Congress for November 2015, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 711(g)(3); Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2951; (124 Stat. 341); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4757. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Annual Report to Congress on the Open Payments Program for April 2016, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1320a-7h(d); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1128G (as added by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 6002); (124 Stat. 693); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4724. A bill to repeal the program of block grants to States for social services; with an amendment (Rept. 114-462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4618. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 121 Spring Street SE in Gainesville, Georgia, as the "Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (Rept. 114-463). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3937. A bill to designate the building utilized as a United States courthouse located at 150 Reade Circle in Greenville, North Carolina, as the "Judge Randy D. Doub United States Courthouse"; with amendments (Rept. 114-464). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 223. A bill to authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3030. A bill to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to convey certain property from the United States to the City of Baudette, Minnesota; with an amendment (Rept. 114-466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 120. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 3rd Annual Fallen Firefighters Congressional Flag Presentation Ceremony (Rept. 114-467). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 119. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 114-468). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 117. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National

Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (Rept. 114-469). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 125. Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026 (Rept. 114-470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1671. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects (Rept. 114-471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3023. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service and the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3340. A bill to place the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research under the regular appropriations process, to provide for certain quarterly reporting and public notice and comment requirements for the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3791. A bill to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4723. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the recovery of improper overpayments resulting from certain Federally subsidized health insurance; with an amendment (Rept. 114-475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4722. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require inclusion of the taxpayer's social security number to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit; with an amendment (Rept. 114-476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2947. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code in order to facilitate the resolution of an insolvent financial institution in bankruptcy; with an amendment (Rept. 114-477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 4841. A bill to establish programs for health care provider training in Federal health care and medical facilities, to establish Federal co-prescribing guidelines, to establish a grant program with respect to

naloxone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016, to enable the payment of certain officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 4843. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require certain monitoring and oversight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 4844. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to revise the regulations relating to certain drivers of commercial motor vehicles involved in oilfield operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 4845. A bill to amend the student loan forgiveness program in the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include a greater number of disabled veterans and to facilitate the automatic transfer to the Secretary of Education of information regarding veterans eligible for student loan forgiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 4847. A bill to repeal the Cuban Adjustment Act, Public Law 89-732, to provide that certain Cuban entrants are ineligible to receive refugee assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4848. A bill to delay and suspend implementation of a comprehensive care for joint replacement (CJR) payment model for episode-based payment for lower extremity joint replacement (LEJR) under the Medicare program in a budget neutral manner; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to reform the work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 4850. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain micro-offerings from the registration requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 4851. A bill to enhance electronic warfare capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 4852. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Regulation D relating to exemptions from registration requirements for certain sales of securities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise certain accreditation requirements applied under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend provisions in the securities laws relating to regulation crowdfunding to raise the dollar amount limit and to clarify certain requirements and exclusions for funding portals established by such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 4856. A bill to make aliens associated with a criminal gang inadmissible, deportable, and ineligible for various forms of relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHN-SON of Texas, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a program to make grants to promote innovations at historically Black colleges and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4858. A bill to provide a declaration of nonnavigability for the central Delaware River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4859. A bill to extend the declaration of nonnavigability in perpetuity for Rivercenter, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4860. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish the United States - Israel Cybersecurity Center of Excellence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4861. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to health centers to expand access to evidence-based substance abuse treatment services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 4862. A bill to determine the feasibility of additional agreements for long-term use of existing or expanded non-Federal storage and conveyance facilities to augment Federal water supply, ecosystem, and operational flexibility benefits in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4863. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Master Sergeant Roddie Edmonds of the United States Army for acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 4864. A bill to revise the crime of sexual assault under Article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to include committing a sexual act upon another person by using position, rank, or authority to obtain compliance by the other person; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 4865. A bill to ensure the development and responsible stewardship of nanotechnology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 4866. A bill to delay increases in flood insurance premium rates for certain properties for 12 months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 4867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide further tax incentives for dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for investments in rural microbusinesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4869. A bill to require a comprehensive regional strategy to destroy the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and its affiliates; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 4870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the establishment of Promise Zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 4871. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of portions of the Los Angeles coastal area in the State of California to evaluate alternatives for protecting the resources of the coastal area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico:

H.R. 4872. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the American opportunity tax credit to support college savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 4873. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require each institution of higher education to describe how it spends tuition and fees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DOLD, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 4874. A bill to require that States receiving grants under the Harold Rogers Prescription Drug Monitoring Program set aside sufficient amounts to facilitate electronic information sharing among States in compliance with the Prescription Monitoring Information Exchange National Architecture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4875. A bill to establish the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 4876. A bill to authorize the establishment of programs to prevent prescription

drug abuse under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GRANGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DOGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VELA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 4877. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3130 Grants Lake Boulevard in Sugar Land, Texas, as the "LCpl Garrett W. Gamble, USMC Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4878. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare Better Care Program to provide integrated care for Medicare beneficiaries with chronic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4879. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to condition a State's receipt of funds for a drinking water treatment revolving loan fund on such State carrying out a program to test for lead in drinking water for schools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4880. A bill to prohibit any regulation, rule, guidance, recommendation, or policy issued after May 15, 2015, that limits the sale or donation of excess property of the Federal Government to State and local agencies for law enforcement activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4881. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance benefits be used to purchase supplemental foods that are eligible for purchase under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (commonly known as the WIC program) and certain additional foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4882. A bill to establish the César Chávez National Historical Park in the

States of California and Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4883. A bill to prohibit the Department of State from obligating or expending any funds to hire a contractor to deliver interactive, professional training seminars for senior-level officials on effective congressional testimony and briefing skills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 4884. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to place an annual cap on support provided through the Lifeline program of the Federal Communications Commission and to provide for certain other requirements relating to such program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. REED, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 4885. A bill to require that user fees collected by the Internal Revenue Service be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4886. A bill to require purchasers of pre-paid mobile devices or SIM cards to provide identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 4887. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 23323 Shelby Road in Shelby, Indiana, as the "Richard Allen Cable Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4888. A bill to provide a path to end homelessness in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YODER (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 4889. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require providers of a covered service to provide call location information concerning the telecommunications device of a user of such service to an investigative or law enforcement officer in an emergency situation involving risk of death or serious physical injury or in order to respond to the user's call for emergency services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Cuba should issue a state of apology and agree to cease human rights violations in order for any embargo or economic restraints to be lifted; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 660. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the territorial integrity of Georgia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. PETERS):

H. Res. 661. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should fulfill its constitutional obligation to provide full and fair consideration of the President's nominee for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mrs.

NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. VELA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. KILDEE):

H. Res. 662. A resolution recognizing March 31 as "César Chávez Day" in honor of the accomplishments and legacy of César Estrada Chávez; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. TAKANO):

H. Res. 663. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Middle Level Education Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 664. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the largest national interdisciplinary research association devoted to the scientific study of education and learning, celebrating its achievements, and expressing support for the designation of April 8, 2016, as "National Education Research Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 665. A resolution commending the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, John Sopko, and his office for their efforts in providing accountability for taxpayer dollars spent in Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H. Res. 666. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 667. A resolution expressing support for designation of September as "National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. LEWIS):

H. Res. 668. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that philanthropy is an integral partner to government with a unique and proven ability to foster innovation, strengthen civil society, and build thriving communities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

184. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 92, expressing support for the western states of the United States and the federal transfer of public lands to these western states, and urging the Congress to engage in good faith communication and cooperation concerning the coordination of the transfer of title to those western states; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

185. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Senate Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt H.J. Res. 58; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 4841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 4842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (18) To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 4843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 4847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 4848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the understanding and interpretation of the Commerce Clause, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation in accordance with Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 4850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is empowered to regulate interstate commerce under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

To provide for the common defense, to raise and support Armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 4852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(a) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 (the Naturalization Clause), which gives Congress sovereign control over immigration and the vesting of citizenship in aliens. In March 1790, Congress passed the first uniform rule for naturalization under the new Constitution. In *Chirac v Lessee of Chirac* (1817), the Supreme Court affirmed this power rests exclusively with Congress.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 4857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to regulate navigable waters under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution (Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3).

USSCT found this in:

*Gilman v. Philadelphia*, 70 U.S. 3 Wall. 713 (1865)

"The power to regulate commerce comprehends the control for that purpose, and to the extent necessary, of all the navigable waters of the United States which are accessible from a state other than those on which they lie, and includes necessarily the power to keep them open and free from any obstruction to their navigation, interposed by the states or otherwise. And it is for Congress to determine when its full power shall be brought into activity, and as to the regulations and sanctions which shall be provided."

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to regulate navigable waters under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution (Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3).

USSCT found this in:

*Gilman v. Philadelphia*, 70 U.S. 3 Wall. 713 (1865)

"The power to regulate commerce comprehends the control for that purpose, and to the extent necessary, of all the navigable waters of the United States which are accessible from a state other than those on which they lie, and includes necessarily the power to keep them open and free from any obstruction to their navigation, interposed by the states or otherwise. And it is for Congress to determine when its full power shall be brought into activity, and as to the regulations and sanctions which shall be provided."

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 2 and 4 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 4862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 4863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5.

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 4864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, Clauses 12, 14 and 18, which give Congress the power to "To raise and support Armies," "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces," and "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 4865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution. The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 4869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 4871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 4872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 4873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 4874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 4875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 5, Clause 2 and Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 4876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 4880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 4884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause [1] and Article I, Section 9, Clause [7]

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 4887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 9 Clause 7 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 4889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, The Congress shall have power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and the general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 174: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 329: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 563: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 590: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 592: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 605: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 612: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 664: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 793: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 825: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 846: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 888: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 897: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 921: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 923: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 952: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 953: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ZINKE, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 969: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 973: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 980: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 986: Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1019: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1111: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1206: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1271: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1343: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1347: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1399: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1482: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1559: Mr. DENHAM.  
 H.R. 1567: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 1602: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 1608: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
 H.R. 1643: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1655: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. TROTT.  
 H.R. 1708: Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 1733: Mr. PETERSON.  
 H.R. 1769: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. KILDEE.  
 H.R. 1774: Mr. HURT of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1779: Mr. LEWIS.  
 H.R. 1882: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 1934: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.  
 H.R. 2254: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
 H.R. 2411: Ms. EDWARDS.  
 H.R. 2450: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2649: Mr. ROSKAM.  
 H.R. 2737: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 2799: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 2817: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. HECK of Washington.  
 H.R. 2896: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. SANFORD.  
 H.R. 2902: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2903: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. BEYER.  
 H.R. 2948: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.  
 H.R. 3029: Mr. GRAYSON.  
 H.R. 3084: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.R. 3105: Mr. SCHRADER.  
 H.R. 3226: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 3235: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 3355: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
 H.R. 3514: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PETERSON.  
 H.R. 3559: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
 H.R. 3666: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 3684: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H.R. 3713: Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 3808: Mr. ROUZER.  
 H.R. 3818: Mr. RIBBLE.  
 H.R. 3917: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 4006: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
 H.R. 4073: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. PAULSEN.  
 H.R. 4177: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 4229: Mr. WALBERG.  
 H.R. 4235: Mr. POCAN.  
 H.R. 4301: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.  
 H.R. 4323: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 4335: Mr. HARRIS.  
 H.R. 4435: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 4442: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 4475: Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
 H.R. 4480: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 4481: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 4485: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 4501: Mr. POMPEO and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 4532: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BUCK.  
 H.R. 4534: Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. YODER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COOK, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. VELA, and Mr. COFFMAN.  
 H.R. 4538: Ms. PINGREE.  
 H.R. 4570: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 4577: Mr. JONES and Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 4592: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 4611: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
 H.R. 4625: Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
 H.R. 4626: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
 H.R. 4633: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H.R. 4651: Mr. RATCLIFFE.  
 H.R. 4654: Mr. CARNEY and Ms. PINGREE.  
 H.R. 4662: Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
 H.R. 4683: Mr. CROWLEY.  
 H.R. 4694: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4712: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4715: Mrs. WALORSKI,  
 H.R. 4730: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ISSA, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. PITTS.  
 H.R. 4764: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. FORBES.  
 H.R. 4768: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROSS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HARDY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.  
 H.R. 4770: Mr. ROSKAM.  
 H.R. 4785: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 4803: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 4807: Mr. COOPER.  
 H.R. 4820: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 4822: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H. Res. 393: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H. Res. 451: Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H. Res. 540: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
 H. Res. 567: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.  
 H. Res. 591: Mr. HARRIS and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
 H. Res. 634: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H. Res. 647: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. LEVIN.  
 H. Res. 651: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H. Res. 658: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
 H. Res. 659: Mr. RANGEL.

---

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Council of the City of New York, New York, relative to Resolution No. 939-A, calling upon Congress to pass and the President to sign S. 1766 and H.R. 3068, the Restore Honor to Service Members Act; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.